# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 042 270 24 EA 003 066

| | |
|---|---|
| AUTHOR | Lazerson, Marvin |
| TITLE | The Burden of Urban Education: Public Schools in Massachusetts, 1870-1915. |
| INSTITUTION | Harvard Univ., Cambridge, Mass. |
| SPONS AGENCY | Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Washington, D.C. National Center for Educational Research and Development.; Joint Center for Urban Studies, Cambridge, Mass. |
| BUREAU NO | BR-8-A-001 |
| PUB DATE | Jul 70 |
| GRANT | OEG-0-000001-0194-010 |
| NOTE | 366p. |
| EDRS PRICE | EDRS Price MF-$1.50 HC-$18.40 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Educational Change, *Educational History, Ethical Instruction, Immigrants, *Industrialization, Industrial Training, Kindergarten, Parochial Schools, Public Education, Urban Education, *Urban Environment, *Urbanization, Vocational Education |

ABSTRACT

Confronted by a rapidly changing urban-industrial society, Massachusetts educators undertook reforms between 1870 and 1915 to make the public school a more relevant institution. Kindergarten, manual training, vocational education, evening schools, and citizenship education represented answers to problems arising from industrialism and urbanism. Educators and social reformers looked to the schools for the preservation of established moral and social values, but the schools could not reshape the urban environment. As a result, the problems of city life remained. Massachusetts schools turned from effecting broad social reforms to preparing children to fulfill economic functions; vocational education replaced manual training as preparation for the real world. (Hard copy may be of poor quality because of marginal legibility). (RA)

BR 8-A-001
PA 24

EA

ED0 42270

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 8A001
Grant No. OEG-0-8-000001-0194-010

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

YC

# THE BURDEN OF URBAN EDUCATION:
# PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1870-1915

Marvin Lazerson
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

July 1970

EA 003 066

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

Final Report
Project No. 8A001
Grant No. OEG-0-8-000001-0194-010

# THE BURDEN OF URBAN EDUCATION:
# PUBLIC SCHOOLS IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1870 - 1915

Marvin Lazerson
Harvard University
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138

July 1970

The research reported herin was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Research

## Table of Contents

Ch. I. The Burden of Urban Education . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

Ch. II. The Kindergarten: Childhood and Social Reform . . . . . . . . 40

Ch. III. Manual Training: The Search for An Ideology . . . . . . . . . 108

Ch. IV. Manual Training and the Restoration of Social Values . . . . 151

Ch. V. From the Principles of Work to the Teaching of Trades . . . . 198

Ch. VI. The Politics of Vocationalism . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 229

Ch. VII. Vocationalism and Equality of Educational Opportunity . . . 267

Ch. VIII. The Quest for Citizenship . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 296

Ch. IX. Form and Substance in Urban Education . . . . . . . . . . . 337

Bibliography . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 344

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Grants from the Bureau of Research of the U. S. Office of Education and a Samuel Stouffer Fellowship from the Harvard-M.I.T. Joint Center for Urban Studies provided the funds and an intellectually exciting environment for the research and writing of this study. A number of individuals granted access to important collections, especially Dr. J. R. Hayden, Superintendent of Schools, New Bedford; Mr. Ernest Jacoby, Director of the North Bennet Street Industrial School; Mrs. Margaret Joy of the Lowell Day Nursery; and Mr. Benjamin M. Tenaglia, Jr., Director of the Lynn Independent Industrial Shoemaking School. The staffs of the Cambridge, Lynn, and New Bedford Public Libraries were hospitable on a number of occasions, while those at the Massachusetts State Library, the Harvard College Library, and the Schlesinger Library of Radcliffe College proved of inestimable value. Tamara Harevan, Daniel Horowitz, and Stephan Thernstrom commented on parts of the manuscript. My friend and colleague, Robert L. Church, criticized the entire study while prodding me to finish it. I am grateful to Oscar Handlin for his advice, mastery of American history, and for allowing me the independence I desired. Needless to say, none of the above should be held responsible for my interpretations. Four other individuals should be singled out. Phyllis Goldwyn, Judith Stevens, and Ann Brown for their skills as typist-editors and Jonathan Smith who served as a model research assistant. Finally, but hardly least, a deep-felt thanks to my wife, Judith Shoenholtz Lazerson, for her patience, editorial incisiveness, and affection.

# THE BURDEN OF URBAN EDUCATION:
# PUBLIC SCHOOL IN MASSACHUSETTS, 1870-1915

by

Marvin Lazerson

## SUMMARY

Confronted by a rapidly changing urban-industrial society, Massachusetts' educators, between 1870 and 1915, undertook reforms which they hoped would make the public school a more relevant institution. Drawing extensively upon the annual school reports of ten Massachusetts cities--Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lowell, Lynn, New Bedford, Springfield, and Worcester--the reports and publications of the Massachusetts Board of Education, and other documents on education from national, state, and local sources, this study focuses on the kindergarten, manual training, vocational education, evening schools and citizenship education as responses by educators and social reformers to the problems of industrialism and the city.

Assuming that New England society had once been homogeneous, its institutions balanced and sharing in the education of all individuals, late ninteenth century reformers believed that a prior social harmony had been rudely shattered. Ambivalent about industrialism, and hostile to the city, they initially turned to the schools to preserve the social and moral characteristics they believed existed at an earlier period. With the emergence of the factory and its unskilled labor force and the disappearance of the apprenticeship system, they called upon manual training to preserve the values of honest labor believed indigenous to a homogeneous rural society.

Through the child, the kindergarten would reshape urban family life and the immigrant community, teaching parents the mores and behavior patterns of the traditional home. By teaching literacy and patriotism, evening schools would inculate the essentials of citizenship bringing cohesion to a heterogeneous urban population.

In practice, such optimism in the school's ability to reshape the urban environment was difficult to retain. Even where educational reforms were implemented; the problems of the city and immigrant life remained. Children dropped out of school as soon as they legally could. After 1900, Massachusetts' schools moved away from broad social change to more effectively fit the child to the new industrial order. Vocational education replaced manual training and claimed that the school should prepare each child for his economic function. Prevocational classes and vocational guidance emerged as preparation for the real world.

By 1915, Massachusetts' schools found themselves caught between reforming society and fitting children to the existing society.

# CHAPTER I

# THE BURDEN OF URBAN EDUCATION

## I

As the twentieth century approached, Massachusetts' educators were deeply troubled. The ideals of commonwealth, that blurring of distinctions between public needs and private desires, in which government acted as a co-partner in the economic and social progress of society, had eroded even before the Civil War, but they had left behind a commitment by government to the welfare of its citizens. While Americans had been engaged in a frenetic quest for individual achievement and thus social salvation, Massachusetts had continued to affirm that society's advancement depended upon social balance and equity, achievable only when its constituents accepted certain common obligations. If the.state had, in practice, lost its earlier role as the key participant in Massachusetts' economic growth, it had, nonetheless, passed statutes and appointed commissions to preserve the responsibility of corporate enterprise to the broader public it served. In the face of industrial change, the revolutions in transportation and communication, it had continually readjusted its laws and institutions to preserve traditional standards of social behavior. Institutional reforms in the political process, child and female labor laws, and other social legislation sought to improve the quality of life and established progressivism in the state before that word had become a movement. Nevertheless, the agitation over and the limits of these activities revealed that the consensus to retain state and citizen responsibility for public welfare was in the process of breaking down. The good government concerns of the Mugwumps had been greeted more with scorn than praise, while those who talked most loudly about integrity in government had been forced into alliances with ward politicians and adventurist businessmen in order to assume even the trappings of power. The social fragmentation of industrial and urban life, and the growing number of immigrants had destroyed the assumptions of commonality, and had heightened the distinctions between public and private.[1]

In this setting, no institution embodied the former ideals of state responsibility for humanitarian reform and social order more than the common schools. Encompassing and serving the needs of community, educator and layman alike viewed the public school as sui generis to American society. To some, they seemed the most distinguishing feature of the state's history, a contribution exceeding the Revolution itself. "But for the American school idea," wrote the Journal of Education in 1888, "we should never have had the American Republic," and few in Massachusetts doubted that the school idea originated in colonial Massachusetts and reached its fruition under Horace Mann. By the end of the Civil War, Mann's arguments for public support of education as essential to a government of free men, and his justifications of common schools as the basis of economic growth and social unity were fundamental assumptions of Massachusetts' educational leadership. The public common schools, supported and controlled by the State, provided a common education "which every citizen of the State must receive as a necessary preparation for citizenship." "This education," the Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education insisted, "must produce such states of mind as are favorable to a common belief in those general principles, and that particular form of civil government which the people have pledged themselves to accept and maintain." It was this, the inculcation of common values in support of an accepted form of government, that the common schools--that "crown of glory to Massachusetts"--provided. Having adopted that assumption, and drawing upon a tradition of state responsibility for the economic and social welfare of its people, Massachusetts provided strong support for its schools in the years after the Civil War. It was thus not without some justification that the future Social Gospel advocate, the Reverend Washington Gladden of Springfield, could declare in 1886, "What education can do to promote morality has been more thoroughly done for Massachusetts than for any other American State."[2]

---

[1] On the nature of commonwealth and its revision before the Civil War, see Oscar and Mary Handlin, Commonwealth (New York, 1947), pp, 53-143, 247-60, passim.; Richard Abrams, Conservatism in a Progressive Era (Cambridge, 1964), pp. viii-x, 1-24, 71-79, 190-216; Geoffrey Blodgett, The Gentle Reformers (Cambridge, 1966), chaps. 1, 2, 5, 9.

In the half century after the Civil War, these assertions that the needs of society and those of the common schools complemented one another became a fundamental assumption of Massachusetts' public education. But as in so many other areas of Massachusetts' life, it was an assumption in the process of reformulation. For the public schoolmen, this would involve a sharpened perception of the State and the common schools' relationship to the State's preservation. Whereas Horace Mann, the first Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, talked about the relationship of a people to the Common needs of a free society, the Board's fourth Secretary, John Dickinson, referred to the dominance of the State in the relationships among men. Dickinson agreed with Mann that neither popular government nor the institutions of public education could exist without the other: "For the existence of a free State a common education of the people is necessary, that they may be trained to think alike and to exercise that common sympathy through which alone it is possible for human individuals to become people." But Dickinson also declared that the existence of a free people in common institutions was impossible "unless they are organized, controlled and supported by the State." Whereas the Massachusetts Constitution urged the diffusion of knowledge and virtue as necessary for the "preservation of their [people's] rights and liberties," Dickinson referred to the necessity of such diffusion for the preservation of the State. As the major spokesman for Massachusetts public education in the 1880's, the Board of Education Secretary

---

[2] Journal of Education, 28: 11/8/88, 304; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report of the Board of Education Together With the Annual Report of the Secretary of the Board, 1887-88, p. 75; ibid., 1888-89, p. 11.(Hereafter cited as Annual Report.); Washington Gladden, "Christianity and Popular Education," Century Magazine, 9: 4/86, 939. On the founding of Massachusetts' schools in the interests of community, see Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1880-81, pp. 62-68; George H. Martin, The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System (New York, 1904), pp. 1-89. A convenient summary of Horace Mann's assumption about schools in a republic is Lawrence Cremin, editor, The Republic and the School (New York, 1957). Numerous examples exist of the adoption of Mann's arguments that common schools produce common institutions and common values. See Journal of Education, 18: 10/11/83, 227-28; ibid., 21: 3/26/85, 201; Lowell, Massachusetts, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1888, p. 18. (Hereafter reports of school committees and superintendents will be cited as School Report.)

---

2 (cont.) The extent of support Massachusetts gave to its public schools in comparison to other states is difficult to gauge. In 1870, per pupil expenditure ranked considerably below western states like Nevada, Montana, and California--understandable in light of their need to provide new buildings for a rapidly expanding population--but also below Georgia, New Jersey and the District of Columbia. Perhaps more revealing of support, however, was Massachusetts' increase in per pupil expenditures between 1870 and 1880, the only eastern state to do so. By 1880, Massachusetts ranked second in the nation in expenditures for schooling per capita and in total expenditures per five to twenty-one year olds in the population. In 1890, the state had dropped to third behind California and Nevada, both of which had highly inflated economies. United States Census Office, Ninth Census, 1870 (Washington, 1872), I, 452; ibid., Tenth Census, 1880 (Washington, 1883), I, 916-18; Lewis C. Solmon, Estimates of the Costs of Schooling in 1880 and 1890 (Lafayette, 1968), pp. 3-5.

placed the results of the social contract upon divine terms: since the State had been organized for "man's well-being, then, like man himself, it must have a divine origin." People lived not simply under the guidance of the State, he wrote, but "the State and the people are one and the same thing." Preservation of the State thus became synonymous with preservation of the people, and "when the State is in danger, even the property and life of individuals must be offered in its defence." Here, in the well-being and defense of the State, educators like Dickinson pressed home their allegiance to the common schools. Since a free State depended upon the intelligence, virtue, and homogeneity of its people, its institutions of education had to be common to all, and more important, had to require allegiance to them. While few Massachusetts educators would go so far as to outlaw non-common schools (i.e., parochial and private schools), all supported compulsory attendance at some school and many supported public inspection of theoretically non-public schools as a defense against the fragmentation of society and thus the destruction of the State.[3]

To a great extent, this heightened awareness of the State as a distinct entity in the thinking of Massachusetts' public educators grew out of their recognition that society had dramatically altered in the decades after the Civil War. Prior to 1860, Massachusetts had moved toward urbanization and industrialization. Between 1840 and 1860 the proportion of population living in cities and towns of more than 10,000 had grown from 18.5% to 36%. The introduction of railroads had begun to annihilate traditional conceptions of time and space, and the new cotton cloth industry, while laying the basis for Massachusetts' industrial prominence, also spawned an industrial proletariat. Although the future appeared in industry and the cities, few could have estimated the extent and impact of those developments. By 1900, most of the state's population resided in 33 incorporated cities, 25 of which had populations above 25,000. During the last two decades of the nineteenth century, these cities had been absorbing newcomers at double the national rate. Between 1890 and 1900, despite the severe depression, Worcester, Lawrence, Springfield, Fall River, Fitchburg, and Brockton had grown by over 40%, while New Bedford had seen its population increase by an extraordinary 53.3%. Even more important than simple growth, was its character. The major increases came among non-English speaking, non-Protestant foreign born. In 1880, foreign born and native born of foreign parents had equalled one-half of Massachusetts' total population. A decade later that proportion would rise to 56.3%; in 1900, to 61.9%, of whom 30% were foreign born, and about a third of these spoke no English. By 1910, 66% of Massachusetts' population was either immigrant or the children of immigrants, and among the foreign born, the non-English speaking outnumbered the English speaking.[4]

---

[3] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1886-87, pp. 70-71; ibid., 1887-88, pp. 70-81; ibid., 1890-91, pp. 100-02; Nicholas Van Slyck, "The Right and Duty of the State to Educate its Children," American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings and Addresses, 1886, pp. 191-201; Boston, School Report, 1887, p. 51; Peleg Aldrich, "The Legal and Constitutional Powers of the Civil Government in Relation to Education" in Massachusetts Board of Education, Forty-First Annual Report, (1876-77), pp. 152-72.

Figures such as these, moreover, greatly dilute the impact of immigration upon the statistics of individual cities. At the turn of the century, not one of the state's 20 largest cities had less than 20% foreign born in its population. Thirteen had more than 30%, while five (Fall River, Holyoke, Lowell, Lawrence, and New

---

[4] Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 5-11; Abrams, Conservatism, p. 28.

Bedford) possessed more than 40%. Of the same 20 cities, only in one were less than 50% of the population foreign born or the children of foreign or mixed parentage. Nine of the cities contained more than 70% in those categories. Fall River, Lawrence and Lowell were among the leading 4 cities in the country in the proportion of foreign born and their children among their inhabitants. In 1900, 47.7% of Fall River's population was foreign born, 45.7% in Lawrence, Lowell 43.1%, and 40.9% and growing in New Bedford. In these four cities, immigrants and their children accounted for between 70% and 86% of the population, while in Boston, Cambridge, and Worcester the same categories accounted for between 67% and 73%. In some urban wards, a non-immigrant face was rarely found. One writer in Outlook, for example, reported in 1901 that the first child she had found on the streets of Lowell who spoke English was the eleventh child she had stopped. The immigration of Europeans, especially of non-English speaking after 1880, had changed the face of Massachusetts. It had also provided the basis for the state's industrial development.[5]

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the most distinctive feature of Massachusetts' economy was its dependence upon outside sources for raw materials and workers. The state's three major industries--cotton goods, boots and shoes, and woolen and worsted products--accounted for about 40% of the aggregate value of Massachusetts manufactures, and all depended almost entirely upon foreign and non-Massachusetts domestic supplies for the materials of production. The same industries contained more than 45% of the manufacturing wage earners in the state, and like the raw materials, these too came from outside Massachusetts. Of the 76,813 wage earners in the cotton goods industries in 1900, 70.2% and 24.6% were foreign born immigrants and children of immigrants, respectively. The three leading cotton manufacturing cities in the state--Fall River, Lowell, and New Bedford--contained more than half the total wage earners, and their labor force was more foreign born than the state-wide totals. Similarly, in the woolens and worsted industries, of the 26,939 wage earners in Massachusetts in 1900, 14,357 (53.2%) were foreign born with 9,901 (36.7%) children of foreign born. Lawrence, which contained 7,180 of the state's woolen and worsted workers, had 4,801 (65.7%) and 2005 (27.9%) in the same categories. While the boot and shoe industry was considerably less immigrant than textiles, here, too, more than half (58.7%) of the 65,671 wage earners were foreign born (26.1%) or their children (32.6%).[6]

---

[5] United States Census Office, Twelfth Census, 1900 (Washington, 1901-02), I, clxxxviii, clxviii. The Outlook quote is in Frederick W. Coburn, History of Lowell and its People (New York, 1920), II, 395.

The prominence of immigrants in Massachusetts' urban-industrial life inevitably affected education and the schools. Illiteracy in the post Civil War period, for example, was preeminently an immigrant problem. Of the 77,550 illiterates in the state in 1875, 91% were foreign born; a decade later, the proportion remained above 88%. In the latter year, 21.5% of all foreign born were illiterate, while the total for the state as a whole was only 7.7% including the foreign born. Most observers concerned about immigrant illiteracy, however, rightly concluded that it was largely an adult problem, one which the open immigration policies of the state accentuated, and they centered their attention before World War I upon evening schools rather than the education of school age children.[7]

---

[6] Abrams, Conservatism, p. 20; U. S. Census Office, Twelfth Census, "Occupations", pp. 302-06, 56-62, 588-90, 598-600, 602, 626; ibid., Thirteenth Census, "Manufactures", IX, 491-93. See also U. S. Immigration Commission, "Immigrants in Industries," Reports (Washington, D. C., 1911), X, 7-8, 18-22; ibid., XII, 212, 227, 361, 445.

There were statistics other than illiteracy, however, which brought home the impact of immigration upon the institutions of education. Studies of birth rates in 1890 and 1900 revealed that foreign born mothers were producing children at a strikingly faster rate than native born. In 1890, for every 1000 native born white mothers in Massachusetts of prime child bearing age (15-44), there were 231 children under 5 years of age born to them. The proportion of children under 5 born of foreign born mothers in the same category was 431 for every 1000. By 1900, the proportions had become 250 children for every 1000 native born mothers and 527 among the foreign born, more than twice the native birth rate. In absolute figures the numbers were even more startling: in 1900, there were 61,064 children under five of native born white mothers and 103,064 children under five of foreign born mothers. And, as to be expected, the proportions in the major cities were even higher.[8]

To most urban educators birth rate and illiteracy statistics were not necessary to establish a relationship between immigration and the schools. They had only to look at the ethnic compositions of their classrooms. By 1900, more than 50% of the state's school children were either foreign born or children of immigrants, and the percentage was almost 58% in the cities. When the U.S. Immigration Commission undertook its extensive nationwide survey "The Children of Immigrants in the Schools," in 1908-09, eight of the thirty-seven cities examined were in Massachusetts, and the findings revealed what had already become obvious to the state's educators. The public schools in four of the eight cities--Boston, Chelsea, Fall River, and New Bedford--contained more than 60% children of foreign born, while Worcester and Lowell were just below that percentage. In the primary grades (1-4), the percentages were even more striking. Two-thirds of the children in the first four public school grades of Boston were of foreign born fathers, almost three-fourths in Fall River and New Bedford. Just four years later, New Bedford reported that 55% of the children in its first two grades were from non-English speaking homes. In three cities studied intensively by the Immigration Commission--Chelsea, Haverhill, and New Bedford--between 9% and 24% of the public school children came from homes where English was not spoken.[9]

---

[7] Horace G. Wadlin, "Illiteracy in Massachusetts," Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1886-87, pp. 225-37; Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1873, p. 386. Illiteracy in 1875 was defined as "those persons (over ten years of age) who can not read, but can write; can not write, but can read; (or) can neigher read nor write . . . " The definition in 1885 remained substantially the same.

[8] U. S. Bureau of the Census, Proportion of Children in the U. S., Bulletin #22, pp. 22-25.

These children of immigrants, overwhelmingly settled in the cities and increasingly coming from homes of non-English speaking parents, provided a major test of public education. They did not, however, in any simple manner, "cause" reform. Rather immigrants were seen as part of a larger process, they represented a congeries of problems associated with urbanization and industrialism. The city, the factory, the poor, the immigrant, all seemed related, and educators were rarely able to distinguish cause and effect. Yet Massachusetts' cities were foreign born, and the state's educators frequently phrased their activities in those terms. That phraseology helped shape the major educational reforms of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries.

---

[9] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1900-01, p. 211; U.S. Immigration Commission, "The Children of Immigrants in the Schools," Reports, XXIX, 8-13, 15, 21, 30, 83, 97; XXX, 179; XXXI, 203, 291, 659, 743; XXXII, 326; XXXIII, 563; New Bedford, School Report, 1913, p. 42.

## II

The ability of Massachusetts' educators to respond to the challenges of industrialization, urbanization, and immigration was seriously circumscribed and coercively shaped by an idealized vision of the past. Believing that institutions had but recently existed in harmony, the schoolmen contrasted the late nineteenth century to a lost rural society, and upon this disjunction they created a philosophy of education and established their programs and policies. While similar themes had appeared just before the Civil War,[10] in the late nineteenth century, they became the dominant motif of Massachusetts' educational thought, reaching their epitome in the autobiography of William A. Mowry.

A graduate of Phillips Academy in Andover, Massachusetts, and Brown University, Mowry's career spanned half a century as school teacher, headmaster and owner of a private school in Providence, Rhode Island, and publisher and editor of such educational periodicals as the Journal of Education (in partnership with Thomas W. Bicknell), Education, and Common School Education. Between 1889 and 1891, he was an influential member of the Boston School Committee, following that with a brief tenure as

---

[10] See Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 3-4.

Superintendent of Schools in Salem, Massachusetts. An acquaintance of all the Secretaries of the State Board of Education since Horace Mann and widely known among the country's leading educators, his frequent talks at educational gatherings and his writings made him a prominent spokesman of New England education.[11]

Mowry viewed his personal success as a kind of object lesson of the gains American schooling had made during the nineteenth century. Nonetheless, as his long career neared its end, he looked to the future of American education with trepidation. Asking the readers of his autobiography to compare society and education "fifty, sixty, and seventy years ago" with the early twentieth century, he provided his own assessment, describing and holding up for emulation his childhood in rural Massachusetts before the Civil War.

> There is no better place to bring up a boy than on a farm, especially if that farm is located in the midst of an intelligent community with a good rural school . . . Rural life in such a district was very simple, honest and irreproachable. There were no crimes or criminals. Doors were seldom if ever bolted. Barns and corn cribs knew no padlocks. No lawyers were needed, as there were no cases in court, either civil or criminal. . . There was no poverty in such a neighborhood. Life was simple, primitive and honest.

Like the surrounding environment, the material needs--food and clothing--were "plain but wholesome," homegrown and economical. Here education was life and thus began immediately and worked effectively.

> If there is any truth in the adage so often quoted in recent years that "We learn to do by doing," surely the farm is the place where the boy more than anywhere else, learns to do many things--more different things than he can learn anywhere else.

---

[11] William A. Mowry, Recollections of a New England Educator (New York, 1908), passim.

On the farm the boy learned his greatest lessons: individual self-sufficiency and independence. "For a boy from infancy till he ceases to be a minor and attains his majority, surely there is no place where he will gain so much, learn so much, do so much, acquire so much, expand his intellect so largely, and over and above all, come to measure his powers so wisely and accurately, and hence acquire so high and sensible an ambition for his future life, as in the home of his parents on the farm."[12]

In such an environment, formal education--the school--built upon and reinforced the values of the home. In the local schoolhouse children of the district met on a common level.

> To all are accorded the same rights, to all are assigned the same tasks, in all the same powers are developed, and all are subjects to the same discipline. Each boy measures himself with his peers . . . here, in the district school, the rich and poor sit in the benches side by side, play together in the yard and at recess, and if the son of the rich man lords it over the Irish washerwoman's boy, that boy gives the offender a good thrashing at recess and teaches him his proper place.

The school taught not simply the three 'R's', but reinforced the essentials of democratic life. Indeed, Mowry conceded that formal pedagogy was more advanced at the beginning of the twentieth century than during his childhood. Life in the present-day city, however, could not provide the vitality, the fullness of inquiry, or the elevation of ideals upon which the old-time school had depended. "In the old times, Mowry concluded, "thoroughness was insisted upon. 'What is worth doing at all is worth doing well,' was a constantly repeated motto."[13]

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 3, 9-14.

Mowry's nostalgic idealizations, more articulate and to some extent more extreme than most, were nevertheless no dissident view among the most prominent members of Massachusetts' educational hierarchy. Assuming the strength of the institutions of rural New England's past, the state's leading public school officials and supporters believed that those institutions had so interwoven and supported one another as to produce a unified, harmonious society.

"In earlier times," the *Journal of Education* wrote in 1889, "all that was expected of the school was the teaching of the three R's. The home disciplined, the church looked sharply after the morals, and the people, being homogeneous, had no problems to solve through the school." "The little red schoolhouse did its work well," recorded George E. McNeill in a report to the Massachusetts legislature in 1893, "because the cottage home, the little white church, the little shop and the town meeting were neighbors co-operating in the training of youth for the duties of life." Particularly in the home and its adjunct, the workshop, the child received his moral values and economic skills, and he found in his childhood environment the foundation of future success. "In the home," the economic historian Frank Tracy Carlton wrote in *Education* summarizing Massachusetts' educators' vision of the past, "the child received the major part of his training for his after life. The home produced and prepared nearly all the food consumed by the members of the family; much of the work which is now carried on in the factory was then performed in the home. It was the scene of diversified industry as well as the center of the child's social life . . . ." "For the growing boy," concluded Boston's influential Superintendent of Schools, Edwin Seaver, "there were the occupations of the field, the woods and the garden; and rainy days there were the tools in the tool room; or, if these failed to interest him, there was the neighbor's shop, where he might begin to learn his chosen trade. The wise father took good care that these means of education were properly used."[14]

---

[13] *Ibid.*, pp. 15-16, 21-31. See also Clifton Johnson, *The Country School in New England* (New York, 1893); Warren Burton, *The District School as It Was, edited by Clifton Johnson* (Boston, 1897); George W. Crocker, "The Rural School of a Half Century Ago," *New England Magazine* 24: 8/01, 583-87; John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," Massachusetts Board of Education, *Forty-First Annual Report* (1876-77), pp. 185-86; Charles O. Thompson, "Handicraft in Schools," *ibid.* (43rd), (1878-79), pp. 261-62; Massachusetts Board of Education, *Report of the Committee to Investigate the Existing Systems of Manual Training and Industrial Education* (Boston, 1893), pp. 26-28. (Hereafter cited as *Report on Manual Training*.)

In effect, late nineteenth century Massachusetts' educators saw in the rural setting of the past a unified educational environment providing for social stability and healthy individual growth. In this society, the school performed limited roles: the reinforcement of moral values introduced outside the classroom and the inculcation of a certain amount of intellectual knowledge. "The home," Superintendent Seaver declared, "was to co-operate with school in the education of the boy, taking more particular charge of the training of his active powers and of his religious life, while leaving the book studies to the school." The school's relationship to the child's future as a craftsman, farmer, or housewife was tangential. It was outside the classroom that such decisions were made and implemented. Seaver cogently summarized the theme of countless educational writings and addresses when he concluded in 1893 that until a generation ago, New England life allowed for the almost complete education of the child outside the schoolroom.[15]

---

[14] Journal of Education, 29: 3/7/89, 153; Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 79, 28; Frank T. Carlton, "The Home and the School," Education, 26: 12/05, 210.

Complementing this notion of a harmonious rural past were the disruption and fragmentation of the present. "A half century," observed the Lowell School Committee in 1887, "has almost completely transformed our industrial world . . . Look over the list of inventions and discoveries that have been made, and trace out their effect and influence upon civilization, and see how almost completely they have transformed it." It was not that improvements had not occurred; indeed, William Mowry wrote, "improvement is the order of the day, the natural course of events." Yet, he continued, "it should be borne in mind that not all that is true is new and not all that is new is true. As a general rule the progress of mankind is seldom forward in a straight line. The motion is in the main forward, but often in a zigzag course."[16]

In education, progress was obvious. Sparsely settled school districts had been consolidated and students classified by grade levels. The growth of professional supervision through the extension of superintendencies of schools to most parts of the state had been matched by advances in pedagogy and teacher quality, particularly through the growth of the state's normal schools. Compulsory attendance and truancy laws were now more efficiently enforced, and perhaps most important, programs such as the kindergarten, manual training, evening centers, and vacation schools specifically designed to meet the needs of the heterogeneous population of the cities introduced. Yet severe deficiencies remained. Many children did not seem to be learning. Schoolhouses in many parts of the state remained ill-equipped and despite the more adequate enforcement of the truancy laws, irregular attendance still existed in some school systems and districts. Classes remained too large, teachers inadequate, funds lacking, public sentiment lagging with regard to supporting the public schools, while debate continued over the benefits of some of the "improvements" in curriculum. If the process of evolution was in the main forward, it "has in it," wrote George Martin, a future Secretary of the state's Board of Education, "necessarily an element of sadness."[17]

---

[15] Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, p. 28; Thompson, "Handicraft in School," pp. 261-62.

[16] Lowell School Committee quoted in Journal of Education, 25: 1/20/87, 35; Mowry, Recollections, pp. 3-4, 265-66.

It was less conditions within, however, than those outside the schools which most affected the educators' view of change. Schools in the past had been part of a society in balance, and they functioned as reinforcers of the values of that society. Now, lamented Edwin Seaver, "the conditions are all changed."

> People have gathered themselves into great and growing cities; the farms are deserted; of gardens there are few; and the neighbors who had workshops for their various crafts are now employed in great manufacturing establishments. Our population has become largely urbanized. The city father, however wise, however disposed to carry on the education of his boys 'by and through work,' finds insurmountable obstacles in his way. His own work is seldom such that he can share it with his boys; the 'neighbor's shop' is hard to find; the 'manufacturing establishment' takes no apprentices.

The opportunity to learn in the congenial setting of the home, the diversified work activities of the rural past, so fondly recalled by William Mowry, had disappeared with the expansion of industry and the urbanization of the population. The shop had become the factory with its altered conception of work, while changes in population, its quality and density, and the individual and institutional relationships they produced had severely altered the probabilities that children would be adequately educated.[18]

---

[17] Mowry, pp. 31-32, 158, 266-70; Martin, Evolution, pp. 190-217, 273-77; R. L. Bridgman, "Schools and the [Massachusetts] Legislature," Journal of Education, 50: 12/28/99, 432; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1885-86, p. 115; ibid., 1895-96, pp. 204-05; Boston, School Documents, 1894, #7; ibid., 1898, #15, pp. 13-18; ibid., 1903, #3.

## III

The fact was, declared Fall River's Superintendent of Schools, Massachusetts was in "an age of cities," and administering the public schools was becoming increasingly difficult.

> The rapid growth of our country in population, the great demand for labor in producing whatever is necessary to the development of its agricultural and mineral resources, with the high prices which have accompanied this demand, have drawn largely from their homes the population of the rural districts. Possessing physical vigor, won in the untrammeled sports of childhood in the country, and principles developed in the pure moral atmosphere of a New England town, they come to the city; and in their eager pursuit of wealth, forget that their children are inhaling the poisonous atmosphere of the streets.

Even the state's rural areas were becoming "peopled by a different class of populations," reported the Board of Education. "The puritan element is fast dying out, and a people with different tastes and different tendencies is gradually taking possession of the land. It is no longer merely the Anglo-Saxon and his descendants, but it is made up largely of those who have been trained in a very different school, or, more correctly, in no school at all."[19]

---

[18] Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 28, 58-68; Runkle, "Manual Element in Education," p. 186.

In their responses to the city, late nineteenth century Massachusetts educators did not significantly differ from many of their contemporaries. Prominent reformers, Boston Brahmins, and some of the state's leading intellectuals and professionals found themselves confused and often hostile to the industrial and urban changes confronting them. The well ordered towns of the 1830's--Lowell and Lawrence were prime examples--had become the industrial problem centers of the 1880's. The conditions of the city, the Board of Education claimed, interfered with the "healthy natural development of children," an observation affirmed by Boston's Edwin Seaver who found "city children like plants in a greenhouse or animals in cages, developing abnormally under abnormal conditions." In such an environment, wrote George Martin, was there any wonder that the "streets of every large city in the world are filled with young persons who have been confirmed in the evil habits by the sins of society--sins of omission and of commission. The lack of suitable playgrounds, of proper places for evening recreation, and of adequate instruction in industry has left the young of both sexes a prey to their own natural but perverted instincts." It was these artificial conditions, the burden of urban life in which social institutions were engaged in constant warfare with the street, that the public schoolmen of Massachusetts believed their worst enemy.[20]

---

[19] Fall River Superintendent quoted in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-fourth Annual Report, (1869-70), "Abstracts," p. 49; ibid. (39th), (1874-75), p.17.

[20] Ibid., 1905-06, p. 91; ibid., Report on Manual Training, p. 29; George Martin, Essentials of Education (Boston, 1932), pp. 149-50. On the response to late nineteenth century changes in Massachusetts, see Barbara M. Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants (New York, 1965); Daniel Horowitz, "Response to Industrialism", unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1967; and Arthur Mann, Yankee Reformers in an Urban Age (New York, 1966). On the development of Lawrence from a model city into an urban horror, see Donald B. Cole, Immigrant City: Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1845-1921 (Chapel Hill, 1963); Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 93-111.

The most immediate problem, however, was facilities. In the rapidly growing urban districts--the suburbs and immigrant wards--overcrowded classrooms and often unsanitary conditions ruled. "It is more and more apparent," wrote the Journal of Education in 1891, "that one of the great American problems is how to 'house' the multitude of children in the city schools." Lowell reported in 1887 that its schools could accommodate less than half of the nearly 12,000 children in the city between the ages of 5 and 15, while the hygienic conditions in the majority of existing buildings were intolerable. In New Bedford, overcrowding in the schools was apparent in the late 1870's when the grammar classes averaged 60 children a teacher, and continued without significant abatement until World War I. The situation was similar in the neighboring industrial city of Fall River where, in 1872, there were often 10 to 15 more pupils in a classroom than seats. In 1913, the city's school board reported that some buildings contained 50% more children than they were intended to hold. Even Boston, which tended to pride itself on its school facilities, experienced severe accommodation problems from the 1880's into the first decade of the twentieth century. During the 1882-1883 school year, the Superintendent reported that 2795 primary school children had registered in the city's primary schools but were unable to attend presumably due to lack of space. Seven years later, children continued to be turned away. The beginning primary class in some schools the next year contained between 65 and 70 children in a room. Two years later, in 1894, despite four years of impressive building growth, the School Committee declared: "At no time in the history of our city has the lack of school accommodations been so pronounced as at present," and a decade later more than 10% of the children in Boston's public schools were housed in halls, corridors, basements, 'portable buildings', and hired rooms.[21]

New buildings and classroom needs invariably raised questions of economics and administration. Attempting to come to terms with the fragmenting effects of urban life, school systems sought structural alterations, reducing the size of school boards, appointing superintendents of schools, and providing for professional supervision. Since school budgets often reflected operating costs and thus usually failed to include expenditures for new buildings, the relationship of school expenses to the general cost of city government is sometimes hard to determine. It appears, however, that public schools accounted for between 10% and 20% of a city's budget in any single year, with a noticeable trend toward the latter figure.[22] Additionally, the issue of school costs was greatly complicated by an often uneasy relationship between the school committee and city government. While the former had ostensible autonomy over the schools, until the turn of the century, school boards often did not control school financing. In Boston, for example, school funds were provided by the City Council until 1898, after which the School Committee received a fixed proportion of tax revenues. Except for a brief two years between 1899 and 1901, the Committee had no control over the financing of school buildings which was handled either by the City Council or a Mayor's appointed Schoolhouse Commission. This autonomy mingled with dependence led to a number of school committee-city government conflicts in almost every Massachusetts city before World War I. On a few occasions, school committees simply exceeded the authorizations of the city council, claiming with some apparent legality, that the city was required to meet the additional expenditures. More often, however, demands by school committees for new buildings, higher teacher salaries, and curriculum innovation were rejected or delayed, a condition which helped provide a basis for widespread philanthropic involvement in the public schools.[23]

---

[21] *Journal of Education,* 34: 9/24/91, 200; Lowell, *School Report,* 1887, pp. 37-39; *ibid.,* 1902, pp. 13-15; New Bedford, *School Report,* 1879, p. 14; New Bedford, "Minutes of the School Committee" (ms. in Office of the School Committee, New Bedford), 2/4/07, 9/11/14; New Bedford, *Inaugural Address of the Mayor,*, 1911, pp. 12-13; Fall River, *School Report,* 1871-72, pp. 3-6; *ibid.,* 1913, pp. 31-33; *ibid.,* 1915, pp. 34-37; Sylvia Chase Lintner, "A Social History of Fall River," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Radcliffe College, 1945, pp. 251, 271, 273-78; Boston, *School Documents,* 1884, #4, p. 7; *ibid.,* 1886, #3, pp. 38-46; *ibid.,* 1891, #7, pp. 3-5; *ibid.,* 1892, #12, pp. 192-99; *ibid.,* 1894, #18, 4-7, 22-24; *ibid.,* #19, p. 28; *ibid.,* 1903, #3, pp. 7-8. The question of accommodations was further complicated by truancy. In 1870, Secretary White of the Board of Education estimated that 25% of the school age population (ages 5-15) were not in school. By the end of the century, while that proportion had dropped below 10%, absenteeism remained a problem. Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report,* 1869-70, p. 120; ibid., 1880-81, p. 75; George Walton, "Report by the State Board of Education on School Attendance and Truancy in Massachusetts," *ibid.,* 1894-95, 527-87; Martin, *Evolution of Massachusetts Public School System,* p. 274.

[22] Michael Katz, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy in Education: The Boston Case, 1850-84," *History of Education Quarterly,* 8: Summer, 1968, 155-88. Cost estimates are based on a comparison of expenditures in Boston, Cambridge, Fall River, Lynn, New Bedford, and Worcester in 1870, 1890, and 1910.

Within the classroom, the urban educators were confronted by two striking phenomena: turnover among their students and a growing proportion of non-English speaking children. The question of population mobility remains extremely ambiguous, but a number of Massachusetts educators recognized that such movement presented an acute problem to the continuity of education. New Bedford's Superintendent, for example, noted the serious educational problems involved when 25% to 50% of the children who ended the school year in many of his city's classrooms had not begun the year there. While few educators specified the extent of the problem, a study of school admissions in the Boston grammar schools between September 1882 and June 1883 suggested that between 20% and 25% of the children moved within the system, that is, changed from one Boston public school to another. The remainder of the children were added to the schools from outside the city or from the local parochial schools. Suffice it to say, the large turnover of population reported by Stephan Thernstrom in Newburyport and Boston probably applied to most of Massachusetts' other cities, and undoubtedly placed severe pressures upon teachers who were constantly faced with having to integrate new arrivals into their classrooms.[24]

---

[23] Chester Finn, Jr., "The Irish in the Boston Schools," pp. 51-54, unpublished manuscript in author's possession. Tension between the city government and school committee often appeared in inaugural addresses of the mayors. See Cambridge, *Mayor's Inaugural*, 1892, p. 38; 1903, pp. 8-9; 1906, pp. 10-11; 1907, pp. 6-8; 1908, p. 4; Fall River, *Mayor's Inaugural*, 1901, pp. 12-13; 1913, pp. 18-21; Lowell, *Mayor's Inaugural*, 1906, p. 16; 1907, p. 10; 1908, p. 8; Lowell, *School Report*, 1886, pp. 12-19; 1890, pp. 13-14; 1898, p. 13.

Even more striking in the discussions of educators than the problems caused by population turnover were those created by the increasingly large number of non-English speaking children reporting to the schools. Particularly after 1890 these children were isolated from the remainder of the school and the traditional subject matter foregone in an attempt to provide English language instruction. Occasionally separated by language groups, they were usually categorized as the non-English speaking and a number of nationalities placed together. In the Hancock School in Boston's immigrant North End, for example, one class of 50 girls was composed of Jews (probably Russian, but likely including other language groups), Germans, Italians, and Portuguese. Most school systems preferred to hire non-foreign speaking teachers, partly because the classes were multi-language anyway, but more often as the most rapid means of insuring complete exposure to the English language while the children attended school. Where children were young, knowledge of English was quickly followed by integration into the regular school program. For the older children, especially those nearing the limits of compulsory attendance, English language lessons were combined with special classes in civil government and occasionally some manual training instruction. Though the ungraded classroom for foreign language children remained a subject of controversy through to World War I, most urban educators agreed with the conclusion of a Lynn newspaper writer: "It is found that the foreign room is a saving rather than an added expense to the school department. In the regular grades these children made but slow progress and thus the teacher was kept back in her work. In this room the children easily proceed with the first four years of the school work when they are ready to enter that of the fifth grade."[25]

---

[24] New Bedford, *School Report*, 1905, p. 118; Boston; *School Documents*, 1884, #4, p. 6. On the general problem of population mobility, see Stephan Thernstrom, *Poverty and Progress* (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 84-90, 167-68 and *ibid*., "Working Class Mobility in Industrial America," paper delivered at Anglo-American Colloquium of Society for Urban History, June, 1968.

Conditions within the classroom, however, were not the only school problems confronting the educators. Of continuing concern were the children who went elsewhere: to the private and parochial schools. Between 1870 and 1910, the proportion of children enrolled in non-public schools rose from 10% to 16%, and whether attending parochial or private schools, such figures represented a threat to ideals of common education. To many, they seemed to undermine the state's commitment to homogeneous institutions and common social values. "It is becoming by no means uncommon," reported the Lowell School Committee in 1878, "for people to withdraw their children from the so-called 'vulgar' associations of the public school, in order to place them in 'select' private schools." Whether the proportion of pupils in non-parochial private schools was increasing before World War I is uncertain, although a sharp increase in the number of such schools between 1880 and 1905 suggests that at a time of major expansion in the public system, they were at least holding their own. "There is danger," wrote a committee revising the curriculum of the Cambridge grammar schools in 1892, ". . . that the children intended for college will be put into private schools where they can have the desired opportunity of early preparation. Such a removal from the grammar schools of promising children, with the best home influences, is unfortunate alike for those who go and for those who stay. . . ." To the public school authorities, the withdrawal of such children seemed to doom the public schools to the education of the poor and immigrant, and to isolation from the colleges. "Cheap schools, supported, but not attended by the wealthy classes, and intended for the education of the children of the poor . . . have no place in a republican State. They are opposed to the genius and character of our free institutions," declared Fall River's School Committee. Speaking before the Massachusetts State Teachers Association in 1898, Edwin Seaver summarized these attitudes when he condemned the people who think "the public school is good for the masses of children, but not good for their children."[26]

---

[25] Edward Everett Hale, "If Jesus Came to Boston," New England Magazine, 11: 12/94, 408-09; F. T. Fuller, "A Typical Tariff Town (New Bedford)," Boston Common, 2/11/11, pp. 7-8; "Cobbett Prepares for Fifth Grade," Lynn Item, 4/20/12.

---

[26] U. S. *Ninth Census*, 1870, I, 450, 455; Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1910-11, pp. 71-75; Lowell, *School Report*, 1878, p. 17; Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, *The Census of Massachusetts, 1905*, I, 938; Cambridge, *School Report*, 1892, pp. 90-91; Fall River, *School Report*, 1877-78, pp. 5-7; Seaver quoted in *Journal of Education*, 47: 1/6/98, 3. See also, *ibid.*, 11: 2/12/80, 104; Lowell, *School Report*, 1889, pp. 21-22; *New England Magazine* (new series), 4: 8/91, 740-42, 811. On the changing attitudes of Boston's Brahmins towards the public schools and their withdrawal into private education at the end of the nineteenth century, see Isabella MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal: Boston Public Schools, 1888-1891," unpublished honors thesis, Radcliffe College, 1967, pp. 34-35, 57-58, 62, 79-81 in Schlesinger Library.

Condemnations, however, were not the only response public school officials made to the competition of upper class private schools. An attempt to persuade the rich to remain in the schools, for example, occurred in 1881 with the opening of the Frederick O. Prince public school in Boston's affluent Back Bay. The new grammar school, considered the "jewell" of the Boston system by the Journal of Education more than a decade after it opened, drew the state's governor, Boston's mayor, and some of the city's leading citizens to its inauguration. But while the building was a magnificent modern structure, with a highly qualified teaching staff, it was upon the social composition of its consumers that most speakers felt compelled to dwell. ". . . The most remarkable peculiarity about this school," declared former Superintendent of Schools John Philbrick, "is found in the character of the population from which its pupils are drawn."

> It so happens that the territorial district of this school is very distinctly defined and cut off from the rest of the city, and that there is not one poor dwelling in it. It is the Back Bay, and nothing else, and that means that it is the home of the wealth and culture of Boston. Now, here is a large, free public school, composed wholly of pupils drawn from homes of culture, wealth, luxury, and refinement.

The fact that such children of wealth and culture had elected to attend a public school "in preference to attending select private schools, which they have left for this," proclaimed John C. Crowley, a member of the School Committee, "renders it in our common-school system altogether unique." It was, all the speakers agreed, the city's finest example of the strength of the public system, and the only means whereby that system could compete with the upper class private schools.[27]

---

[27] Journal of Education, 14: 11/17/81, 324, ibid., 37: 4/6/93, 211-12; Boston, School Documents, 1881, #26, 103-09; Boston, School Report, 1881, pp. 89-112.

Such adaptability to the desires of the affluent, however, became increasingly more difficult as Massachusetts' cities became more heterogeneous. The Back Bay was a unique phenomenon, effectively cut off from the nearby working class districts. Few other cities could boast of such isolated upper class sections, and even more rarely could urban public school systems assure special educational advantages for long periods in such areas. The movement of immigrant children into the schools and the expansion of the high school into a more democratic institution probably helped push the upper classes into private schools or surrounding suburbs.[28]

The seeming hostility of Massachusetts' upper classes to the public schools unsettled many, though not all, of the state's public school educators. As attendance at public high schools increased, a number of the schoolmen contended that private schools served a necessary function as first-rate college preparatory institutions. Similarly, others commended such schools for their willingness to experiment, thus making them teachers to the public system.[29] Private schools for the affluent, moreover, seemed considerably less threatening to the traditions of common education than the rapid expansion of the Roman Catholic parochial schools, though here too the relationship between public schoolmen and private education remains more ambiguous than at first glance.

In 1873, parochial school attendance was estimated at 7500 pupils. A quarter of a century later, it had grown to 61,500, an 800% increase, while public school enrollment hardly doubled. By the first decade of the twentieth century, between 13% and 15% of all school children in Massachusetts were enrolled in parochial schools. Again, as in the statistics of immigration, state-wide totals dilute the magnitude of the situation in the state's large cities. In Cambridge in 1905, 19% of the children enrolled in schools were in parochial classes, less than 2% in non-parochial, private, and the remainder in the city's public schools. Since the proportion in private non-parochial probably remained fairly steady or declined since the 1880's, parochial school attendance increased from about 8% of the children in the city ages 5 through 14 (most of whom were enrolled in school) in 1888 to 15% in 1894, to the nearly 20% of those in school in 1905. Between 1900 and 1915, Boston's parochial schools increased their proportion of school age children from about 14% to 18%, with a decline in private, non-parochial classes from about 6% to 3%. The extent of parochial school attendance was even more striking in cities with the highest proportion of foreign born. In Lawrence, in 1878, even before the parochial school movement began to flourish, more than 18% of all children 5 to 15 in the city were receiving parochial education. By 1915, the proportion had almost reached a third of the city's enrolled school population. In Fall River, as early as 1890, around 30% of the city's school children were in parochial schools, and the School Committee predicted continuing growth in attendance. In neighboring New Bedford, more than 25% of the city's 5 to 15 year olds were in Catholic schools in 1900, a proportion which appears to have dropped to about 23% five years later, but returned to 26% in 1910. The extent of parochial education in the major cities of the state was summarized in 1915 in a survey of Massachusetts' eight largest cities (other than Boston) undertaken by the School Committee in Fall River.

---

[28] Edward Kirkland, Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 6-7, 150. Enrollment in public high schools in Massachusetts increased from 15,826 in 1875 to 23,317 in 1890 and 59,068 in 1910. See also, Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (New York, 1964), pp. 169-189.

[29] Mowry, Recollections, pp. 58-72, 140-44; Journal of Education, 58: 8/27/03, 148.

In the industrial, heavily immigrant cities of New Bedford, Lawrence, Lowell, and Fall River between 24% and 35% of the children enrolled in schools were in Catholic parochial classes. In the less immigrant cities of Springfield, Worcester, Cambridge, and Lynn, the proportion went from 12% to 23%. In every case, the overwhelming number of pupils in parochial schools were children of immigrants.[30]

The statistics of parochial attendance provided the public educators of Massachusetts with one of their greatest challenges, and they responded in a variety of ways. Initially, led by the (New England) *Journal of Education* and one of its editors, the peripatetic A. D. Mayo, public school supporters attacked the very concept of a parochial school. In the late 1870's and 1880's, the *Journal* engaged in a continuing controversy with Catholics, particularly the *Catholic Review*, designed to show that parochial education led to more crime, illiteracy, and pauperism than the public schools. The movement towards parochial schools, Mayo wrote in 1877, was led by "parsons and priests." The mass of Catholics were "satisfied with the public schools, appreciate their value, and only with the greatest reluctance withdraw their children from them." "Now, when the *Journal of Education*, as the advocate of our American system of free education, protests against this crusade of the ecclesiastics and their followers, and exposes the compromises suggested in that interest, some zealous brother, cleric or lay, immediately rises to accuse us of 'unjustly attacking the

---

[30] Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1900-01, pp. 199, 201; Cambridge, *School Report*, 1894, pp. 3, 13; *ibid.*, *1905*, p. 75; Finn, "Irish in Boston Schools," p. 17; Boston, *School Documents*, 1905, #11, p. 12; *ibid.*, 1915, #12, p. 14; Lawrence, *School Report*, 1878, p. 13; Fall River, *School Report*, 1890, p. 14; *ibid.*, 1915, plate #16; New Bedford, *School Report*, 1900, pp. 3-4; *ibid.*, 1905, pp. 3-4; *ibid.*, 1910, p. 4; U.S. Immigration Commission, "The Children of Immigrants in the Schools," XXIX, 144.

Catholic Church and clergy.'"[31] By the end of the 1880's, however, with Mayo no longer an editor, the Journal had considerably moderated its attacks on parochial schools. Though still standing against them and defending the common schools as essential to the unity of American life, the Journal contended that hysterical attacks served only to consolidate Catholic support of their schools. Comparing the fanaticism of the anti-parochial school forces to the fanaticism of John Brown, the Journal wrote in 1889, that such hysteria would only lead to the two united groups at war with one another.[32]

The changed tone of the Journal's articles on parochial schools, apparent by the end of the 1880's and becoming even clearer during the 1890's, reflected the shape of things to come. Despite a vigorous controversy over State control and inspection of the parochial schools in 1889, a controversy as much related to Republican and Democratic politics as educational issues, Massachusetts' educators tended to redefine the issue of parochial schools less as threats to the state or to the ideals of American unity than as pedagogical competitors. With 25% of his city's school children in parochial classes, New Bedford's Superintendent wrote in 1891, the future of the public schools depended not upon attacking Catholics but upon upgrading the quality of public education. The parochial schools in Boston,

---

[31] Journal of Education, 4: 6/24/76, 6; ibid., 11: 5/27/80, 338; ibid., 6: 9/27/77, 138-39; ibid., 8: 12/19/78, 389. See also, 4: 9/16/76, 109-11; ibid., 4: 9/23/76, 122-23; ibid., 5: 1/25/77, 43; ibid., 12: 9/9/80; ibid., 14: 10/6/81, 220-21. On A. D. Mayo, see Lawrence Cremin, The Wonderful World of Ellwood P. Cubberley (New York, 1965), pp. 15-17.

[32] Ibid., 27: 1/12/88, 25-26; ibid., 29: 5/9/89, 296; ibid., 34: 10/1/91, 217-18; ibid., 49: 2/9/99, 88.

Newburyport, Brockton, Hyde Park, Salem and Springfield had stolen an advance on the public schools, reported the Journal of Education in 1891, by introducing typewriting and stenography into their curriculum. Reaffirming the New Bedford Superintendent's position, the Journal declared: "The public schools must never be so conservative as to allow any other institution to do better work or to do it more promptly."[33]

Even more revealing was the ability of most urban public school educators to live in harmony with the local parochial schools--provided they were taught in English. In Cambridge, for example, despite some conflict, a Catholic priest who claimed that parochial schools were desirable for Catholic children joined the city's School Committee and appears to have worked harmoniously with it. In Lowell, during the 1870's and 1880's, at a time when controversy between public and parochial schoolmen in the state was high, the School Committee acknowledged that parochial schools were lightening the economic burden of public education upon the city, and that the Catholic pastors had invited the Committee to visit their schools at its pleasure. A similar attitude was manifested in New Bedford where parochial schools in the late 1880's reduced attendance pressures upon the public classes. Discussing the withdrawal of public school children to a newly opened Catholic school in 1886, New Bedford's Superintendent wrote: "Thus it will be seen that in one sense certainly, the Parochial schools have been of signal advantage to the interests of the public schools. The two north Parochial schools (almost entirely children of non-English speaking immigrants) have an attendance of about 1200; and it can easily be seen that were those pupils still dependent on the city for their schooling, a large increase of school accommodations would have been required." Eleven years later, the superintendent estimated that the parochial schools were saving the city $40,000 to $50,000 yearly in addition to $200,000 which would be necessary for new schoolhouse facilities. Similar attitudes appeared in Haverhill in the 1880's, Lawrence in the 1870's and 1880's, though in each of these cases distinctions were made between the Irish and French Canadian Parochial Schools, while in Lynn an amicable working arrangement was established between the Greek Orthodox schools and the public schools.[34]

---

[33] New Bedford, School Report, 1891, p. 39; Journal of Education, 34: 11/26/91, 345. On the 1880's controversy over state inspection of private and parochial schools, see Lois B. Merk, "Boston's Historic Public School Crisis," New England Quarterly, 31: June, 1958, 172-99 and MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal," pp. 24-26, 47-63.

Indeed, the reports of school committees and superintendents of schools clearly indicate that despite occasional flare-ups, parochial schools were often viewed as only moderate threats by public school officials. Especially after 1890, the relationships between the two school systems in most cities, while often uneasy, had little of the vitriol which had marked the statements of the Journal of Education and A. D. Mayo in the 1870's and early 1880's. More realistically appraising the continuing existence of parochial schools, many schoolmen looked upon the parochial classes as a relief from the economic burdens of education every Massachusetts city had to bear. A number of schoolmen adopted positions of competitiveness and sought through curricula innovations to provide what the economically hard pressed parochial schools could not.[35]

---

[34] Cambridge Chronicle, 7/3/80, p. 4; ibid., 9/18/80, p. 1; Lowell, School Report, 1879, pp. 45-46; ibid., 1880, pp. 49-50; ibid., 1883, pp. 53-54; ibid., 1888, p. 27; New Bedford, School Report, 1883, p. 17; ibid., 1886, p. 26; ibid., 1897, p. 32; Lawrence, School Report, 1872, pp. 9-10; ibid., 1880, pp. 33-34; ibid., 1887, p. 22; Haverhill, School Report, 1887, pp. 66-70; ibid., 1888, pp. 31-34; Lynn Item, 4/20/12, 11/9/12, 5/13/16.

## IV

Inadequate facilities, conflict over financing, population turnover, non-English speaking in the classroom, and competition from private and parochial schools--these were some of the problems Massachusetts' urban educators had to confront in the decades before World War I. These issues, however, only partially shaped the responses of the schoolmen, for the major problem, as they saw it, lay not in the schools, but in the society in which schools functioned. Believing that the institutions of modern social life had deteriorated, that they no longer worked harmoniously and interdependently, and that the rural school had depended upon and been nourished by the vigorous social balance surrounding it, Massachusetts' educators sought to delineate their institutional roles in an industrial, urban, immigrant society.

They began by stressing the limits of their ability to reconstruct relationships, stressing the roles of other institutions. Gradually, however, they began to see public education as the crucial instrument for dissolving social corruption and disorder. "If we were to define the public school as an instrument for disintegrating mobs, we would indicate one of its most important purposes," wrote the *Journal of Education* in a statement continually reiterated with only the subject matter varying. Through the common schools, ethnic minorities would be brought into harmony, government cleansed, class conflict alleviated, the basis for vocational achievement laid, and the preservation of revered values assured. The process by which public educators came to believe themselves the sole restorers of harmony, and the public school the central formative experience of American life is complex, and encompasses more than the assumptions and activities of educators. But in Massachusetts, it depended upon the disjunction between the social order of the past and the social fragmentation of the present. Believing the new urban society artificial, and overwhelmed by the problems of administering large school systems, Massachusetts' public schoolmen moved to reconstruct their relationships. Inevitably, they began with the institution they considered the fundamental base of a balanced society--the family--and in the urban environment, they found it wanting.[36]

---

[35] The major exception to this generally benign relationship occurred in the conflicts between public schoolmen and the French Canadian parochial schools. The latter were invariably singled out for their commitment to a foreign language, the poor facilities of the schools, and their seeming hostility to long-term residence and assimilation in the United States. On a number of occasions, school committees balanced praise of the Irish Catholic schools with sharp criticism of the French schools. See Lawrence, School Reports, 1882, pp. 32-33; 1883, pp. 41-42; Haverhill, School Reports, 1886, pp. 47-48; 1889, p. 29; 1890, pp. 27-28, 46-47; 1891, pp. 18-20; Cambridge, School Report, 1889, pp. 53-54; Journal of Education, 29: 2/14/89, 104; 34: 12/31/91, 427-28; 41: 3/28/95, 217; Worcester, School Report, 1913, pp. 40-41; MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal," pp. 61-63.

The educators' assumptions about late nineteenth century family life are easily schematized. The family's multiple functions, particularly the provision of moral values and instruction in basic vocational skills, had been eliminated by industrialization. Placed in the city, the family's members could neither commune with nature nor achieve that balance between interdependence and independence which seemed to mark rural society. Where the family was poor or immigrant, and the two usually seemed to converge, it also appeared hostile to the mores and cultural patterns of the dominant society. "Look at the homes of three-quarters of the children in many of our cities and towns," wrote an agent of the State Board of Education, "and say whether the moral condition of the young is not lowered rather than raised by such influences." For the first time, reported the Massachusetts Bureau of the Statistics of Labor in 1875, there is a "considerable number of parents who would not only permit but force their children to grow up in ignorance." A year later, the Cambridge School Committee noted the large number of children "who at home never hear a kind word, and are surrounded by depraving influences . . . ." Family life in the city, wrote Samuel Dutton, soon to become Superintendent of Schools in Brookline, was in a state of disarray, the children tainted "either by bad blood or by vicious training." The schools, concluded New Bedford's Superintendent, summarizing a broad consensus, confronted the overriding problem of "material": the children of multiple nationalities and multiple family backgrounds. "Many of these children have no refining influences at home, but the contrary. They, in fact, have few if any home advantages."[37]

---

[36] *Journal of Education*, 12: 8/26/80, 153; ibid., 16: 12/7/82, 361; *ibid.*, 32: 12/18/90, 392-93; ibid., 42: 12/12/95, 400-01; Cambridge, *School Report*, 1876, p. 7; *New England Magazine* (new series), 5: 3/87, 483; Massachusetts Board of Education, *Report on Manual Training*, p. 66; *ibid.*, *Annual Report*, 1907-03, p. 305

These conditions, as Dutton's and the New Bedford Superintendent's statements suggested, always seemed worst among the lower classes. The belief that the poor, particularly the immigrant poor, were failing their children became a dominant theme of the era, and pervaded discussions on education from the Civil War to World War I.

---

[37] John Prince, *Moral Training and School Government* (Boston, 1884), p. 2; Massachusetts Bureau of *Statistics of Labor*, *Annual Report*, 1875, p. 45; Cambridge, *School Report*, 1876, p. 7; *ibid.*, 1890, p. 55; Samuel T. Dutton, "Education as a Preventive and Cure for Crime," American Institute of Instruction, *Proceedings*, 1886, p. 15; New Bedford, *School Report*, 1899, p. 69; *ibid.*, 1894, p. 58.

The topic varied--kindergartens, manual training, truancy, art education--but the assumptions remained the same. The question of discipline in the schools provides a striking example. Before the Civil War, corporal punishment had received its major justification on the basis of in loco parentis, with teachers sharing the powers of correction with the home. In the late nineteenth century, however, its primary support came as a necessity for the "heterogeneous masses of children" who come from homes where "discipline is defective." Justifying its use, one of Boston's leading schoolmasters declared that "where many of the children come from miserable abodes, destitute of all home comforts, and oftentimes even of decent influences, and where there is no moral training or judicious and proper discipline, the rod will be necessary in the school-room." The issue of home influence, of family background and the use of the rod, however, reached its height in 1889 when a major controversy erupted in the Boston School Committee over the latter.[38]

At least twice since the Civil War, the School Committee had recommended curbs on corporal punishment in the schools, with little apparent effect.[39] Now, in 1889, Superintendent Seaver sought a modification in the school system's rules to require that all cases be reported and reviewed by the Board. A majority of its members responded with outrage. In a report of a special committee, adopted by the Board, the association between immigrant family life and school discipline received its clearest exposition. "This whole question of corporal punishment," wrote Committee member Samuel Capen,

---

[38] Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 173-74; Haverhill, School Report, 1889, p. 25; Joshua Bates, Our Common Schools (Boston, 1879), p. 16.

[39] Boston, School Report, 1869, pp. 8-65; ibid., School Documents, 1889, #5, pp. 36-38.

> is largely one of civilization, and the amount required for the discipline of a school depends mainly upon the character of the pupils composing that school. That character, of course, depends upon the homes from which these children come. If a child has learned to obey in the family, he comes naturally under restraint in the school. But suppose he has never had a home, as we understand the term; has lived in the streets and slept anywhere at night, which is true of some of the children in our schools, then the case is different. We have one School District in this city from which 1/3 of all the arrests for crime are made . . . We have, in one of our schools, 280 boys from Russia and Italy. The teachers in some of these schools who are trying to rescue and save these boys from ruin are engaged in a mission almost as holy as the ministers of religion. To have these teachers--who by their surroundings are compelled to punish, when other more fortunate in their environment are not--make reports which are brought up into this chamber, and looked over, away from the locality, is a wrong to them."

At issue, Capen contended, was not corporal punishment, but the character of the school population.

> There have been great changes in our population during the past few years. In a room of 50 pupils there may often be found 6 or 8 nationalities. Many of these children come from homes of vice and crime. In their blood are generations of inequity. . . They hate restraint or any obedience to law. They know nothing of the feelings which are inherited by those who were born on our shores. Yet, by the compulsory education laws of this State, our schools are obliged to take these children.

Some school districts in the city were centers of violence and crime, attacks upon teachers--even a case of a revolver being drawn upon a teacher--common. A perpetual state of war existed, and talk of eliminating corporal punishment simply strengthened the element of violence by undermining the teacher's authority. Strong teachers, Capan concluded, were all that stood between these boys and a life of crime.[40]

---

[40] Boston, School Documents, 1889, #5, pp. 39-46; Ibid., #19 ("Report of the Committee on Rules and Regulations on Corporal Punishment").

In many ways, Samuel Capen's report was an anachronism. Few believed that a state of war existed in Boston's schools or in any other Massachusetts city's schools. Moreover, the emergence by the late nineteenth century of a pedagogical reform movement which stressed student interest in learning and friendlier relations between teacher and pupil undoubtedly curbed the rod's use in the classroom. But Capen's hostility to immigrants, his association of urban evils with the failings of social institutions outside the school, was neither atypical nor without influence among the state's educators. His corporal punishment report received enthusiastic support from that bulwark of the Massachusetts public schools, the Journal of Education, and was adopted by the Boston School Committee. And, Capen's role in Boston school affairs was not limited to this report. Beginning in the 1880's and continuing into the twentieth century, he exercised great influence over the School Board's decisions and school appointments, often in close association with another member of the Board, Joseph Lee, with Capen, a co-founder of the Immigration Restriction League.[41]

By the late nineteenth century, whether one agreed or not with Samuel Capen's hostility to immigrants, Massachusetts' educators had adopted his assumption that the city threatened social values. Convinced, in addition, that schools could not reinforce moral values where the family failed to instill them, the state's educators faced a choice of either resuscitating urban family life or substituting for it. "We have . . . to face the startling fact," declared Samuel Dutton, "that the family, which has been called 'the molecule of the social world,' is throwing upon the school much of the responsibility that justly belongs to it."[42] Initially, as in the case of the early kindergarten and manual training movements, attempts were made to restore older values, with the efforts of the school directed toward revitalizing the home. Increasingly, however, urban educators looked upon the school as a surrogate of the family, convinced that the majority of families in their cities could neither provide support for their children nor be reinvigorated. The trend was strikingly revealed in the kindergarten movement.

---

[41] Journal of Education, 31: 1/9/90, 24-25. On Capen and the Boston schools, see Chauncy Hawkins, Samuel Billings Capen (Boston, 1914), pp. 53-78 and MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal," pp. 64-68. On his anti-immigrant attitudes, see Solomon, Ancestors and Immigrants, pp. 84, 85, 88-89, 104, 118; Hawkins, pp. 189-92; Boston, School Report, 1889, pp. 214-15. The Boston Finance Commission, Report, 1911, p. 8, considered Capen one of the eleven individuals who had most influenced the city's schools since the early nineteenth century. On Joseph Lee, see Solomon, pp. 136-140.

---

[42] Dutton, "Education as a Preventive," p. 15.

# CHAPTER II

# THE KINDERGARTEN: CHILDHOOD AND SOCIAL REFORM

## I

In 1874, at the age of 70, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody sat down to write a new preface to the third edition of her notes on Bronson Alcott's school. She praised Alcott's pedagogic innovations, his warmth and humanity, and his ability to communicate with children. But as she wrote, her mind was undoubtedly focused elsewhere, upon another master teacher whose views of children and childhood education she had been campaigning for since the early 1860's. Referring to Alcott, Peabody commented, "I think that he will not disagree with me that Froebel's method of cultivating children through artistic production in the childish sphere of affection and fancy, is a healthier and more effective way than self-inspection, for at least those years of a child's life before the age of seven." Alcott, she continued, had improved her understanding of teaching, but by the mid-1870's he had become little more than a precurser whose activities had enabled her to comprehend the depth and scope of Friedrich Froebel's contribution to childhood education.[1]

At the time she wrote the preface, Elizabeth Peabody had become the leading proselytizer for the kindergarten in America. Having first become involved with the new institution for children in 1859 through contact with Mrs. Carl Schurz, she had opened a kindergarten school in her Boston home the following year. From that moment until sickness and finally death overcame her in 1894, the kindergarten movement dominated her existence. She lectured, wrote pamphlets and articles, and seized upon every opportunity to define the kindergarten, explain its uniqueness, and acquaint the American public, especially its educators, with the name of Friedrich Froebel. In 1867 she traveled to Europe to study recent developments in early childhood education and returned even more enthusiastic about adapting Froebel's ideas to America. Three years later, her essay "Kindergarten Culture" was reprinted in the United States Commissioner of Education's annual report, and in 1873 she established the Kindergarten Messenger, a monthly periodical, as a means of propagating her views. Even after financial difficulties forced her to merge and ultimately give up her publishing venture, she continued to provide moral support to those advocating the new institution, returning briefly to publishing in 1878 as co-sponsor of the Kindergarten Messenger and the New Education. To Miss Peabody, the kindergarten was not simply a method of education, but a movement of mystical significance. She considered her advocacy an "apostolate", kindergartening a religion, a "vocation from on High" and a "Gospel for children."[2]

---

[1] Elizabeth Peabody, Record of Mr. Alcott's School (Boston, 1874), pp. 4-5.

---

[2] Ruth M. Baylor, Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: Kindergarten Pioneer (Philadelphia, 1965), pp. 18-19, 81-147; Mary J. Garland, "Elizabeth P. Peabody, 1804-94" in International Kindergarten Union, Committee of Nineteen, Pioneers of the Kindergarten in America (New York, 1924), pp. 19-25; Lucy Wheelock, "Miss Peabody As I Knew Her" in Pioneers, pp. 26-38. The quotations are from Elizabeth Peabody, Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners (Boston, 1893), pp. 22, 88 and The American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings and Adresses (Boston, 1871), p. 7. For a self-appraisal of her work up to 1876, see New England Journal of Education, 3: 1/1/76, 9. Among her most important writings on the kindergarten are: "American Kindergarten" in Elizabeth Peabody and Mary Mann, Moral Culture and Kindergarten Guide (Boston, 1863); "The Kindergarten," U.S. Bureau of Education, Circulars, July, 1872; Lectures in the Training School for Kindergartners (cited above); "A Plea for Froebel's Kindergarten as the First Grade of Primary Education," in Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, The Identification of the Artisan and Artist (Boston, 1869). A complete list of Peabody's works can be found in Baylor, Peabody, pp. 194-207.

Such language came easily to this woman who had shared a classroom with Bronson Alcott, was secretary to William Ellery Channing and a friend of Ralph Waldo Emerson, and whose home and bookshop in the 1840's had functioned as a salon for Boston's Transcendentalist intelligentsia. These New Englanders were peculiarly responsive to the language of German idealism, and concerns for the unity of life, the assertion of man's triumvirate relationship to God, nature, and humanity, and anti-materialism--all voiced by Froebel--were familiar and acceptable to Boston's mid-nineteenth century cultural elite. Certainly Transcendentalism and educational reform found union in Peabody's own family where she found companionship with her two brothers-in-law, Nathaniel Hawthorne and Horace Mann. Her sister, Mrs. Mary Mann, had written on education as early as 1841, emphasizing naturalism and warmth in teaching young children, in a book later republished by Peabody as part of her kindergarten campaign.[3]

But if Transcendentalism provided a base for the reception of Froebel's ideas, extensive concentration on it would be misleading. Many who ultimately supported the kindergarten movement had little if any acquaintance with the New England idealists, and American kindergartners drew less upon the Alcotts and Emersons than upon their own translations and interpretations of Froebel. It was here that Elizabeth Peabody assumed paramount importance. For Peabody, as well as for other early advocates, the kindergarten without Froebel was a non sequitur, a fraud masquerading under the title "children's garden." Through Peabody's efforts, Froebel's most famous works were published in the United States, and when some found the master's language too complex even in translation, they resorted to publishing their own expositions of his ideas. Froebel, they claimed, was the first to uncover a true understanding of childhood. He discovered the early plasticity of children, their spontaneous and natural needs, and elaborated a scheme for meeting those needs through activities and play materials.[4] Froebel, his followers believed, was so endemic to the institution itself that as the kindergarten movement expanded, Peabody, Mrs. Mann, Henry Barnard, and a number of other prominent educators established the American Froebel Union in 1877, for the express purpose, Peabody wrote, "of keeping the standard of the kindergarten up to the mark of Froebel." Three years later, G. Stanley Hall's study of Boston first grade children bore witness to the prominent role Froebel played in the daily activities of the kindergarten when one child described God as looking like the German master teacher.[5]

---

[3] Baylor, Peabody, pp. 41-63, 125; Van Wyck Brooks, The Flowering of New England (New York, 1952), pp. 233-240, passim.; Louise Hall Tharp, The Peabody Sisters of Salem (Boston, 1950), passim.; Peabody and Mann, Moral Culture. On the broad relationship between Transcendentalism and the kindergarten, see Fred Erisman, "Transcendentalism for American Youth: The Children's Books of Kate Douglas Wiggin," New England Quarterly, 41: June, 1968, 238-47.

While the first American kindergartners thus vowed complete allegiance to

---

[4] Three of the many attempts to explain Froebel's goals and methods to an American audience were: Peabody, "A Plea for Froebel's Kindergarten";[Anne Page *et. al.*] *The Kindergarten and the School* (Springfield, Mass., 1886); Kate Douglas Wiggin, ed., *The Kindergarten* (New York, 1893).

[5] Baylor, *Peabody*, p. 112. The founding of the Union is described in the Cambridge *Chronicle*, 5/11/78, p. 2. G. Stanley Hall, "The Contents of Children's Minds" in *Aspects of Child Life and Education* (New York, 1921), p. 34. Emphasis on Froebel should not be misconstrued into an association of the American kindergarten movement with the early kindergartens founded by German emigrés like Mrs. Schurz. These classes often established before the Civil War as educational and cultural institutions designed to preserve some form of German life in the United States appear to have had little influence on the American movement, especially after 1870. See Baylor, *Peabody*, pp. 32-37, 84, and Nina Vandewalker, *The Kindergarten in American Education* (New York, 1908), pp. 12-18.

Froebel, their advocacy in practice drew upon selected themes in the German educator's writings, particularly his belief in universality. The Americans, like Froebel, dealt with Truth, the Child, the Home, Family and Motherhood. Their program, its goals and methods, they asserted, applied to all members of society, though some could benefit more than others. Parents were the "divinely-appointed instructors of their children"; the Home, Mrs. Horace Mann wrote, could be the "regenerator of society." Success in the Home, however, depended upon the Mother, who had to introduce her children to moral law, beauty and truth, and expose them to their first knowledge of God. Mothers, Mrs. Mann declared, had to be prepared for Motherhood. They should study languages, philosophy, sciences, history, and art, and they should retain responsibility for rearing their children rather than turning it over to uneducated nurses. But while the early kindergarten advocates were intrigued by the social and moral possibilities of the Family, they devoted most of their attention to the Child.[6]

Their assumptions about childhood were simple and in one form or another continually repeated during the last decades of the nineteenth century. Before the age of three, the major thrust of the child's growth was self-centered. He discovers the body, his senses, and his power to act. Under his mother's tender care, however, he becomes selfish and egotistical, demanding that his needs and desires be immediately satisfied. Were he to continue to develop in this way, neither society nor the individual could survive. Thus, after the age of three, socialization becomes the child's central need, a process which even the best family cannot adequately perform. It is here that the kindergarten becomes necessary to complement the individualization of the child's early growth, allowing him "to take his place in the company of his equals, to learn his place in their companionship, and still later to learn wider social relations and their involved duties." Only in this society of equals can his social instinct be gratified and brought into equilibrium with the instinct of self-preservation. "A kindergarten, then," Peabody wrote, "is children in society--a commonwealth or republic of children--whose laws are all part and parcel of the Higher Law alone."[7]

---

[6] New England Journal of Education, I: 1/2/75, 1; Mary Mann, "The Home" in Kindergarten Magazine, I: 9/88, 133-36 and 10/88, 165-68; Alice Putnam, "The Use of Kindergarten Material in Primary Schools," in [Page], The Kindergarten and the School, p. 94.

Unfortunately, children could not be expected to interact perfectly since human nature could be vicious. To the peer group society was thus added a trained adult who kept order by uprooting evil tendencies. It was this notion, the analogy of the garden, which most appealed to the kindergarten propagandists. The kindergarten, Peabody declared, was a garden of children, and like the gardener's cultivation of each plant until it reaches perfection, the kindergartner helps the child develop by carefully removing obstacles to natural growth and by providing his natural nourishment. As the gardener must know plants, the kindergarten teacher had to understand children. Essential to this, of course, were the natural instincts of womanhood. Kindergarten teachers had to possess what Boston kindergartner Mary Garland called true Mother requisites: natural charm, loving sympathy with children, an intuitive knowledge of nature, a devine kinship with nature's inmost spirit, and a liberal education added to innate intellectual ability. The Mother and kindergartner had virtually the same tasks, though the latter's were more generalized: "To direct the tendencies of mind and heart, to prepare the mind to love truth and goodness, to lay broad and deep the foundations on which the future educator may build in beauty and strength--this is the work of the mother and the kindergartner."[8]

---

[7] Peabody, Lectures, pp. 4, 66-67; Baylor, Peabody, p. 167; Peabody and Mann, Moral Culture, pp. 12-14.

This association could even be widened with many kindergartners contending that their class was actually an extended family, providing love and affection in a broader social setting. Continually, people like Elizabeth Peabody stressed this complementary relationship, the sharing of child development between the old institution of the family and the new kindergarten. One speaker at a National Education Association meeting could not believe the kindergarten possible without strong homes. Another translated an address on "The Kindergarten in its Relation to Motherhood" into a panegyric on the glories of Motherhood. Still a third speaker believed, "The mother as handmaid of the Lord, will recognize in the consecrated kindergartner a fellow-worker in the garden of the Lord." To these enthusiasts, the kindergarten stood as the extension of ideal Motherhood, the transition between the individualistic education of the home and the social necessities of the broader society.[9]

As the kindergartners repeatedly emphasized, the peer group environment was fundamental to the child's socialization. What they meant by socialization, however, tended to become obscured by their attempts to unify essentially contradictory themes: emancipation and creativity versus uniformity and control. The former was undoubtedly most striking both to the kindergartners and to those who observed them. Certainly, the early kindergartens provided pleasurable activity. By emphasizing love and understanding of the child, by calling for creative expression, youthful teachers, and the elimination of corporal punishment and parrot-like memorization, the kindergartners created institutions of enjoyment and excitement. They advocated movement and activity for children who desired and needed both, introduced new play objects into the environment, and were willing to accept noise as a healthy corollary of happy play. "Of the two evils," Elizabeth Peabody wrote, "extreme indulgence is not so deadly a mistake as extreme severity." In her recommendations to prospective kindergarten teachers, she asked that activities be planned for the morning hours "using up the effervescent activity of children, who may healthily be left to themselves the rest of the time, to play or rest, comparatively unwatched."[10]

---

[8] Peabody and Mann, *Moral Culture*, pp. 10-15; Peabody, *Lectures*, pp. 4-5; Mary J. Garland, *Essays on the Kindergarten* (Boston, [1934?], pp. 7-11; Angeline Brooks, "The Theory of Froebel's Kindergarten System" in [Page], *The Kindergarten and the School*, p. 47.

[9] Mrs. James L. Hughes, "The Kindergarten and the Home" in National Education Association, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses*, 1895, pp. 531-33; Sarah B. Cooper, "The Kindergarten in its Relation to Motherhood," ibid., 1889, pp. 467-73; Mrs. Elizabeth P. Bond, "The Kindergarten in the Mother's *Work*," *ibid*., 1885, p. 359. See also, Mary S. Boone, "The Kindergarten From a Mother's Point of View, *Education*, 25: 11/04, 142-51; Nora A. Smith, *The Children of the Future* (Boston, 1898), pp. 28-29. Almost any discussion of the kindergarten before 1900 contained similar statements.

But if the early kindergarten emphasized self-direction and creative activity, it did so in a controlled setting, whose ultimate goal was order through development and harmony. The kindergarten was, after all, a "guarded company of children." In this environment, educational issues need not be defined in terms of spontaneity versus control or self-expression versus uniformity. All could be harmonized. "The education of children by a genial training of their spontaneous playful activities," Peabody wrote, "to the production of order and beauty was an essential feature of the kindergarten." Children became morally disciplined and cultured when they acted "to the end of making others _happy_, rather than of merely enjoying _themselves_." Individual happiness, fundamental to the kindergarten, could be disorderly and vitiating unless it functioned as social enjoyment. Criticizing Rousseau's individualistis and anti-social educational theories, Peabody concluded, "All government worthy of the name begins in self-government, a free subordination of the individual in order to form the social whole." The need for such socialization could hardly be underestimated. "The child is doubtless an embryo angel; but no less certainly a possible devil . . . Evil is the inevitable effect of an ignorant, disorderly action of the will; of its not adopting the laws of order. . ."[11]

---

[10] Peabody, _Lectures,_ pp. 15-18, 64; Peabody and Mann, _Moral Culture,_ pp. 23-24; Peabody, _What is a Kindergarten?_ (Cambridge, 1874).

Justification of the kindergarten as an institution necessary for the socialization of the young child thus began to take on broader social meaning. It was not simply an egotistical child who threatened society, but also a spontaneous one. Self-government of the individual's conscience and a reliance upon peer group pressures for order were necessary but insufficient to assure individual and social stability. Obedience was essential for order, and order, Mary Mann wrote, "I regard as 'heaven's first law.'" The kindergartner's role became a means of pampering the universal good in children, while channeling their individualistic and creative idiosyncracies into orderly behavior.[12]

To produce this socialization, the kindergartners evolved a complex and highly structured methodology of play, games, and activities. Building upon Froebel's assertion that play represented the highest and purest form of activity for young children, they established an ordered environment within which the child learned by doing. Repeatedly, they enunciated as their first principle that "all education proceeds from the self-activity of the child." Such activity was spontaneous and natural, and satisfied the child's most basic needs for movement and self-mastery. "It is through the activity of play," Angeline Brooks wrote, "the only activity in which the child is free and joyous--that the ends sought in the kindergarten are attained . . . ." Children, moreover, play not simply at games, but in all they naturally undertake. "If they march, they are playing soldiers; if they build with the gifts, they are playing at building; if they work at weaving, or sewing, or paper-cutting, they are playing that they are working. There are no tasks in kindergarten." Supporting the establishment of public school kindergartens in Boston in 1870, Peabody reiterated this point: "The idea has hitherto been that it is necessary to *paralyze play* in order to produce an attentive mind. But the child is always *attending to what it is playing with* . . . ." The kindergartner's goal, then, was to take advantage of this basic energy and interests since no child should be left "to a chaos of chance impressions." While activity in children was spontaneous, "orderly activity needs the direction of others." In Froebel's kindergarten, the teacher goes "to the child where he is, and *help(s) this play* so that it shall be successful in its aim, and thus lead to a profitable examination of the playthings . . . ."[13]

---

[11] Peabody, Lectures, pp. 2, 4-5, 14-15, 44-46, 67, 78.

[12] Peabody and Mann, Moral Culture, pp. 148-50, 182; Peabody, Lectures, p. 179.

Play, the spontaneous energies of the child channeled into orderly behavior, thus became the keystone of the kindergarten. But all play activities were not of equal value. Music, song games, and marching which called for great activity but kept children within a highly structured program and prevented "disagreeable romping" were fundamental. On a higher level, formalized games helped the child internalize rules which would allow the kindergarten and later society to function harmoniously. As one kindergartner put it, "The ordinary child remembers to be good; the kindergarten child forgets to be naughty." Equally important for the child was the manipulation of objects in his external environment. Froebel's "gifts"--soft cloth balls, blocks, cubes, rings, triangles, spheres, and cylinders--introduced the child to geometrical forms and suggested the harmony and symmetry of life. Less important but still necessary in a well-run kindergarten were such utensils as paper, scissors, clay, desks and slates, pencils and paint, weaving and sewing materials which incited creative activity and helped develop manual dexterity. Manual education found a home in the kindergarten where the manipulation of objects seemed to lead to "such a harmonious development of the physical, mental, and moral capabilities of little children as no other system of education has ever secured." Small gardens were equally necessary to offer children an object lesson in organized natural growth. Above all, Peabody and others warned, avoid the overuse of books, let the child learn the use of objects before the words of adults. Under proper play conditions the peer group society guided by a trained kindergartner would learn virtue, cooperation, altruism, and truthfulness.[14]

---

[13] Lucy Wheelock, "The Purpose of the Kindergarten," *Journal of Education*, 34: 7/2/91, 36; Angeline Brooks, "Philosophy of the Kindergarten" in Wiggin, *The Kindergarten*, pp. 119-21, 131; Elizabeth Peabody, "Kindergarten Schools," *Massachusetts Teacher*, 23 (third series): 7/70, 237-40; Peabody, *Lectures*, pp. 1-23; Richard Boone, "Non School Education: Education Through the Home and by Play," *Education*, 23: 10/02, 86-90.

By emphasizing the introduction of new instruments of learning designed specifically for children, the kindergartners placed their moral and social ideals of education into a complex and elaborate material setting. Some of the early advocates went even further than the list described above. Elizabeth Peabody's first kindergarten, for example, included three rooms on the lower floor of her house, "a large china closet which I use for the children's dressing, as well as to store many things; and beyond the third room, a bathing room with every convenience. . . A large playground and some garden. . . ." It should be understood, she noted, that "Kindergarten education is not cheap." In essence, organized play in a materially well-endowed environment became the mechanism of orderly growth.[15]

---

[14] Peabody and Mann, Moral Culture, pp. 34-51; Wiggin, The Kindergarten, p. 2; Angeline Brooks, "The Kindergarten Gifts and Occupations" in [Page], The Kindergarten and the School, pp. 79-93; Laura Fisher, "Principles and Methods of the Kindergarten," Journal of Education, 38: 12/14/93, 386-87; L. H. Marvel, Manual Education in the Public Schools (Boston, 1882), p. 9; International Kindergarten Union, Committee of Nineteen, The Kindergarten (Boston, 1913), pp. 125-26; Smith, Children of the Future, pp. 67-100.

These views of childhood education received impressive support in the closing decades of the nineteenth century from a new emphasis upon early habit formation and from the emerging child-study movement. Although earlier Lockean ideas had laid the basis for an emphasis on childhood learning, not until the end of the nineteenth century did American educators generally acknowledge the importance of the early years in shaping adult behavior. To the kindergartners, this was an article of faith. The young child, they argued, was both malleable and perceptive. Writing in the New England Journal of Education, Miss Susan Blow, who with William Torrey Harris would establish the country's first system of public school kindergartens in St. Louis, stated: "While the understanding and reason still sleep, the sensitive mind is receiving those sharp impressions of external things, which held fast by memory, transformed by the imagination, and finally classified and organized through reflection, result in the determination of thought and the formation of character." "The first seven years of the child's life," wrote Angeline Brooks, "Froebel saw to be the most important for purposes of education; for, as he said, during that time tendencies are given and the germs of character are set." Having found that the child's social and moral character could be shaped at an early age, the kindergartners also asserted that the influences would be life-long. In 1886, the Journal of Education simply concluded that "In the first 7 or 8 years of a child's life it will probably be settled whether he is to be swayed by superstition or intelligence, whether he is to live terrorized by fear or buoyed up by hope and courage." Under these circumstances, the kindergarten appeared vital.[16]

---

[15] Peabody and Mann, Moral Culture, pp. 26-27.

Further support for the kindergarten appeared as a by-product of the child-study movement, particularly the ideas formulated by G. Stanley Hall. President of Clark University, indefatigable organizer, prolific author, editor, and public speaker, Hall played in the years prior to World War I a seminal role in the fields of child and adolescent psychology. To the kindergartners, however, his major contribution to education lay as the "father of the child study movement," the individual who made of childhood "a gospel." It was Hall who provided a scientific rationale for Froebel's views that education was evolutionary and developmental, and that human growth was a process of stages. It was Hall who popularized natural education as most applicable to the stage of childhood, and who urged the public to allow children to express their needs and peculiarities. The extraordinary breadth and proliferation of his studies and those inspired by him made child study a national topic of discussion. Teachers, parents' associations, educational journals, women's clubs clamored for information and speakers on the child. "The child study movement," Nina Vandewalker wrote in her history of the kindergarten, "must be considered one of the epoch-making movements in the history of American education."[17]

---

[16] Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 169-71; Susan Blow, "The Kindergarten," New England Journal of Education, I: 5/15/75; Brooks, "Philosophy of the Kindergarten" in Wiggin, The Kindergarten, pp. 103-108; Journal of Education, 24: 11/18/86, 324. See also, Wiggin, "The Relation of the Kindergarten to Social Reform" in Wiggin, The Kindergarten, p. 19; Mary A. Guyse, "The Kindergarten as an Agency for the Control of Pre-School Welfare and Education," NEA, Proceedings, 1917, 427-29; Smith, Children of the Future, pp. 129-32.

Mixing science, observation, and propaganda, with the latter two often usurping the former, Hall's psychology drew upon Darwin for its emphasis upon genetics and heredity and for the methodology of observing life in its natural surroundings. To these Hall added a third theme--psychic recapitulation--one of immense importance in stimulating his enthusiasm for child study, but of almost complete irrelevance to the kindergartners who needed no assurance that infants and children recapitulated the forms of psychic expression marking the evolution of mankind to justify their interest in children. What most interested the kindergarten advocates was less the specifics of Hall's psychology than his generalities about providing children with an opportunity to play, and his observations that such play was almost always constructive. His injunction that teachers and parents "get out of Nature's way and allow her free scope, and avoid excessive checks and inhibitions" was readily echoed by the kindergartners. His calls for teachers to know their children confirmed what others already knew. It was thus not surprising that in 1880 when Hall sought to study children entering the first grade in Boston's public schools, he should be financed by Boston's leading supporter of kindergartens, Mrs.

---

[17] Charles Strickland and Charles Burgess, eds., Health, Growth, and Heredity: G. Stanley Hall on Education (New York, 1965), pp. vii-viii, 1-3; Vandewalker, The Kindergarten in American Education, pp. 235-39; Merle Curti, The Social Ideas of American Educators (Paterson, N. J., 1963), pp. 396-428 remains the best study of Hall. On the child study movement, see Wilbur H. Dutton, "The Child-Study Movement in America from its Origin (1880) to the Organization of the Progressive Education Association (1920)," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1945 and Charles J. Brauner, American Educational Theory (Englewood Cliffs, 1964), pp. 66-82.

Quincy Adams Shaw, or that four of Mrs. Shaw's kindergarten teachers should act as investigators.[18]

"The Contents of Children's Minds," the title of the 1880 study, is worth examining, for its publication propelled Hall to the forefront of the child-study movement, and it revealed some of the reasons Hall's early theories found such ready support from the kindergartners. Hall's essential goal was to take an "inventory of the contents of the minds of children of average intelligence on entering the primary schools" of Boston. Basing his approach on similar studies in Germany, he formulated questions which "should lie within the range of what children are commonly supposed or at least desired or expected, by teachers and by those who write primary text-books and prescribe courses of instruction, to know." The findings, Hall claimed, were shocking. Children existed in almost total ignorance of what he considered the commonplaces of life: 80% of the children were ignorant of beehives, 54% of sheep, 87% of a pine tree, 61% of growing potatoes, 80% of the location of the heart, 40% of a pond, 92% of a triangle, 56% of a square, 62% of a spade. Children of Irish parents were even more ignorant than those of American parents, and Hall concluded that any first grade teacher who assumed knowledge on the part of her students would be greatly disappointed and would be failing in her obligations to them.[19]

Such alarming results, however, contained some positive affirmations of the kindergarten. Children who had been to the charity kindergartens where "superior intelligence of home surroundings can hardly be assumed," did substantially better than the other children, regardless of nationality. Moreover, most primary teachers interviewed found children from the kindergartens better fitted for school work and more intelligent, though often more restless and talkative. Perhaps most revealing was the relationship between Hall's standards of intelligence and the activities of the kindergarten. The test items were heavily weighted toward rural images and activities, and consciously so. "As our methods of teaching grow natural," Hall believed, "we realize that city life is unnatural, and that those who grow up without knowing the country are defrauded of that without which childhood can never be complete or normal. On the whole, the material of the city is no doubt inferior in pedagogic value to country experience. A few days in the country at this age has raised the level of many a city child's intelligence more than a term or two of school-training could do without it."[20]

---

[18] Strickland and Burgess, Hall, pp. 6-13; Hall, Aspects of Child Life, pp. vi, 11; Smith, Children of the Future, pp. 12-13.

[19] Hall, Aspects of Child Life, pp. 10-19, 22-24.

These views paralleled basic assumptions of the early childhood educators. Kindergartners conceived of the city as an artificial environment antipathetical to natural growth, and sought in the "children's garden" a surrogate for urban life. Nature walks, small gardens, and freedom to play that was assumed to be the life style of the rural child were essential ingredients of the kindergarten, while the strenuous play activities of the countryside found their parallel in the marching and games. The wood carving, sewing, drawing, sand and mud manipulation which Hall thought fundamental to growing up intelligently were recreated in a variety of forms in the children's classes. Most kindergartners, then, could find Hall's assumptions and his study of the "contents of children's minds" gratifying. Not merely had kindergarten children outdistanced the others, but the general solution advocated by the child psychologist pointed directly to expansion of their institution.[21]

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 19-21, 25-26.

Hall's early work thus confirmed and further popularized the kindergarten. Particularly by reinforcing the plea to treat children as children, and providing them with "natural," even if artificially produced, settings, the child study movement added to the chorus of people calling for educational institutions which dealt with the distinctive characteristics of childhood. Kindergartners were prominent contributors to Hall's periodical, Pedagogical Seminary; child study soon became embedded in the course of instruction at teacher training schools. Nonetheless, Hall's child study movement was not the kindergarten, at least not the one advocated by the followers of Friedrich Froebel. Hall believed that the kindergarten could never substitute for rural life, and he found the highly constructed play and "gifts" of the kindergarten restrictive of natural childhood. He seemed to believe that the restraints placed on children in most kindergartens hindered the child's evolutionary development. At a convention of the International Kindergarten Union in 1895, 33 of the 35 persons in the audience walked out on a Hall lecture when he called for a revision of traditional Froebel classes and the substitution of more natural activities. Suffice it to say, Hall's question, "What is a Child?", was of crucial importance to early childhood education, but it did not define the kindergarten. Rather, Hall's psychology was used to reinforce and set a seal of approval upon the rapidly emerging features of the "children's garden."[22]

---

[21] Ibid., pp. 300-321; Strickland and Burgess, Hall, pp. 16-18, 53-58. For examples of the anti-urban bias of kindergarten supporters, see Peabody, Lectures, pp. 1-23; Ellise B. Payne, "The Problem of the City Kindergarten," NEA, Proceedings, 1896, pp. 510-514; Jenny B. Merrill, "Children's Gardens," ibid., 1898, p. 598; Edwin P. Seaver in Massachusetts Board of Education, Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate the Existing System of Manual and Industrial Education (Boston, 1893), p. 29.

## II

Above all, the ideology of the early kindergarten movement emphasized its universal application. Whatever home background the child came from, the kindergarten would enlarge and idealize it, providing for all children a transition from "the dreamland of infancy to the earnest preparation for the realities of life." Yet in Massachusetts the earliest kindergartens were less than universally applied. People like Elizabeth Peabody, Mrs. Horace Mann, and Matilda Kriege, a German emigré, represented backgrounds of culture, and they spoke to individuals of wealth. Tuition fees at Miss Peabody's kindergartens on fashionable Pinckney and Winter Streets in Boston in the 1860's ran to $50 for a 40-week term, which included daily French instruction from a specially hired teacher in addition to the regular kindergarten activities. Mrs. Kriege and her daughter conducted their Boston kindergarten in a "high rent" house on socially prominent Charles Street, while Mrs. Louise Pollock, soon to become a leading figure in the movement, opened her first kindergarten in 1864 in Professor N. T. Allen's private English and Classical School in the Boston suburb of West Newton. Similarly, the first kindergarten in Worcester, started by a graduate of Mrs. Kriege's kindergarten training course, charged $50 for a 40-week term of three hours per day. The limited application of these early classes was best summarized by an article in a Boston newspaper during a drive in the early 1870's to establish public school kindergartens: "So long as Kindergartens remain private schools with the price of tuition fixed at from sixty to a hundred dollars per year, they will be of little real importance."[23]

---

[22] Vandewalker, The Kindergarten in American Education, pp. 8, 245; Sara Wiltse, "A Preliminary Sketch of the History of Child Study in America," Pedagogical Seminary, 3: 10/95, 189-212; Lynn, Massachusetts, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1896, p. 54; Curti, Social Ideas, pp. 415-16; Strickland and Burgess, Health, pp. 19-22; Winifred Bain, Leadership in Childhood Education: A History of Wheelock College (Boston, 1964), pp. 15-16; Hall, "Recent Advances in Child Study," NEA, Proceedings, 1908, p. 950.

Even the early justifications of the kindergarten emphasized the particular responsibility of the affluent and cultured to improve their child care. Children would remain beautiful, Elizabeth Peabody declared, only "if truly cultivated persons took our children in hand from babyhood. . . instead of leaving this work to the most ignorant class of the community, such as the general run of the servants who have the education of them during their earliest infancy." When Matilda Kriege's kindergarten, which had replaced Peabody's in Boston, was undergoing financial difficulties at the end of the 1860's, Peabody chastized "Our rich and cultivated people [who] will not forego a little more upholstery than is necessary or a style of dress that makes the laundry bill . . . larger than the school bill, in order to give the required remuneration to the kindergartner for spending herself on their children in exhausting study and labor." With the rich still insufficiently supporting the kindergarten, its practitioners, Miss Peabody claimed, should come from comfortable circumstances, representatives of the "most refined circles of private life." Even when Boston initially experimented with a public school kindergarten in the early 1870's, "circumstances made it necessary," former Superintendent of Schools John Philbrick later wrote, ". . . . to locate it among the better class of population . . . ." Indeed, as late as 1881, Boston's Journal of Education carried an article from an English periodical which emphasized the inability of home nurses among Britain's aristocracy to care adequately for children, and reasserted the need for kindergartens among the upper classes.[24]

---

[23] Journal of Education, 26: 7/7/92, 45; Baylor, Peabody, pp. 85-86, 88; Caroline D. Aborn, "Matilda H. Kriege, 1820-99," in International Kindergarten Union, Pioneers of the Kindergarten, p. 42; Anna B. Knox, Kindergarten (Worcester, 1871), pamphlet advertisement in Massachusetts State Library, Boston; A. G. W., The Kindergarten, What Is It ? (Boston, [1872-74?], pamphlet copy of newspaper article in Harvard University Library.

Although the kindergarten's benefits seemed peculiarly adapted to the affluent and cultured, its future in Massachusetts nonetheless lay elsewhere. At the end of the nineteenth century, kindergarten advocates began to focus on a particular segment of American society: the urban slum. While industrialization, immigration, and urbanization had created an awareness of poverty and the slum before the Civil War, the social problems of the city in the 1880's and 1890's came under more intensive investigation and received more publicity than had previously occurred. Never before had the improvement of the urban child assumed such immense proportions nor had the urban school ever seemed so vital a means of social reform. Heightened concern for the slum helped spawn a new view of poverty which looked at the results of economic hardship rather than simply condemning them as a cause of social ills. Americans, as Robert Bremner has pointed out, began to define poverty in terms of insufficiency and insecurity, as no longer desirable or necessary. The belief that poverty was debilitating paralleled assertions that its evils--disease, want, disrupted families--could be eradicated by the social measures of an aroused public, by a reorganizing of the environment in which the poor lived. Simultaneously, the child and his home, not simply as symbols of the child study movement, but as special objects of charity received new attention. In Massachusetts, and particularly in Boston, children's aid organizations sprouted and flourished. Volunteer workers for local charities reported that "labor among the children . . . [was] the important part of work . . . ." These "visitors," members of the Associated Charities movement--agencies organized for the rationalization of welfare--found that they could accomplish most "in the homes of the children." "Here, by means of books, games and pictures, the visitors can bring brightness and activity instead of dreariness and idleness. The comfortable and interesting home will be the best safeguard against outside temptations."[25]

---

[24] Peabody, Lectures, pp. 3, 13, 19; John Philbrick, "The New Departure in Boston," New England Journal of Education, 11: 2/19/80, 116; Journal of Education, 13: 3/31/81, 217-18.

Not all educators adopted this new view of urban poverty. Of those who did, few could articulate it this completely. But the kindergartners and those who supported them found the attitudes and goals of the social welfare movement congenial. The kindergarten's anti-urban bias accentuated the horrors of the slum, and provided a vantage point from which to view poverty. Kindergarten advocates fixated on the idea that slums and a healthy family life were antithetical, making formal early childhood education absolutely necessary. The home, considered by the kindergartners the essential base of their institution, "the original and ever-present teacher," the editor of Education put it, was being dramatically altered by urban life. Admittedly, the problem was not entirely based in the urban slum. The rich, as Elizabeth Peabody and others never tired of pointing out, often spoiled their children, unfitting them for social and moral leadership. But the failings of the affluent were being overwhelmed by the problem of the poor. The ideal home, Mary Mann wrote, assumed the freedom of parents to fulfill their obligations to their children, but "a degree of poverty that obliges parents to leave their children daily, makes it impossible to realize theoretical results . . . ." "Whatever we may think of it for the rich," one writer on kindergartens declared, "it would seem self-evident that it is what is needed for the children of the poor." It was, the editor of Century Magazine argued, "our earliest opportunity to catch the little Russian, the little Italian, the little German, Pole, Syrian, and the rest and begin to make good American citizens of them." As early as 1879, at an American Institute of Instruction gathering--the bastion of New England educational professionalism--one speaker hoped that kindergartens would be found in "every neighborhood in which the destitute live."[26]

---

[25] Robert Bremner, From the Depths (New York, 1956), chs. 1, 3, 5, 8, 9; Lawrence Cremin, The Transformation of the School (New York, 1962), p. 59; Nathan I. Hugins, "Private Charities in Boston, 1870-1900," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1962, chs. 3, 5; Associated Charities of Boston, Annual Report, 1880, pp. 23-24; ibid., 1886, pp. 33-34.

To the advocates of the kindergarten, children of the poor were, by definition, "uncared for." They were faced, Jacob Riis wrote, with a "Hobson's choice" between the tenement and the street, the former overcrowded and unsanitary, the latter corrupt and anarchic. Mary Mann, usually a sympathetic observer, was reported to have described

---

[26] Boone, "Non School Education," p. 83; Mary Mann, "The Home," Kindergarten Magazine, I: 10/88, 165; Alice Rollins, "Seed, Flower and Fruit of the Kindergarten" in Wiggin, The Kindergarten, pp. 47-48; Richard W. Gilder, "The Kindergarten: An Uplifting Social Influence in the Home and District," NEA, Proceedings, 1903, p. 390; American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1879, p. xiv.

Cambridge slum children as "little savages from three to five, the pests of the streets, their mouths full of profane and obscene language." With these views in mind, educators continually returned to such doctrines as the malleability of the child and the social importance of fixing childhood habits. Massachusetts supporters of the kindergarten unanimously agreed with a speaker at the National Education Association in 1885 who stated that "The age at which children leave the home circle and enter the broader realm of the school is the most important and the most critical, because most susceptible period of life." The Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education believed there was no question that the kindergarten which "takes children at their most impressible age," molds them, and leads them to right habits and attitudes, "is preeminently a school for training in manners and morals."[27]

Educators also intensified their emphasis upon socialization as a means of social control. Kindergartens could create internal mechanisms of control: the slum child would learn to police himself, thereby relieving society of the burden of policing him. Kindergarten News reported that the introduction of the kindergarten among the urban poor was based on the principle that the prevention of pauperism and criminality was better than their cure. The present failure of the home and school, Kate Douglas Wiggin, the author of Rebecca of Sunnybrook Farm and a leading kindergartner, wrote, was their tendency to appoint "more and more 'monitors' instead of training the 'inward monitor' in each child." Blind obedience to authority was not in itself moral and indeed, under the present conditions of society, could not be effective without the internal restraints provided by the kindergarten. Perhaps the most succinct statement of what the kindergarten could do for the slum child appeared in the Journal of Education in 1882. Describing a kindergarten in Boston's immigrant North End, containing children between the ages of three and five, the reporter observed "the dark eyes and keen faces of little Isaac or Israel," English and Irish children, occasionally "some dove-eyed Italian child, in its quaint national costume," learning politeness, thoughtfulness and personal kindness, happiness leading to goodness, truthfulness, and cleanliness. She concluded, "And little children, defrauded from their birth, are brought out of sin and darkness into a pure, sunny atmosphere. . . ." To the kindergartners, the urban street and home seemed an environment of terror; the slum, the incarnation of evil, destructive of the growing child and ultimately of society itself. Without an institution willing to accept children on their own terms, willing to recognize their need for activity and play, society would one day confront adults bred in anarchy. The kindergarten, to its strongest advocates, was just such an institution.[28]

---

[27] Jacob Riis, "Children of the Poor," in Robert A. Woods, et al., The Poor in Great Cities (New York, 1895), p. 114; Cambridge Chronicle, 5/11/78, p. 2; Clarence Meleney, "The True Object of Early School Training," NEA, Proceedings, 1885, p. 314; Massachusetts State Board of Education, Annual Report, 1901-02, p. 94.

By 1885, speakers at national education conventions asserted that the kindergarten was a philanthropic and charity venture to care for the unfortunate children of the congested city, an effective means of reaching the previously unreachable. In Massachusetts, during the two decades before 1900, educators repeatedly affirmed the necessity of kindergartens for slum children, particularly if they were foreigners. In

---

[28] Kindergarten News, 3: 1/93, 8; Wiggin, "The Relation of the Kindergarten to Social Reform," pp. 12-15; Kate L. Brown, "The Moral Influence of the Kindergarten," Journal of Education, 15: 3/16/82, 166-67.

Lawrence, the Superintendent of Schools was unwilling to recommend that kindergartens be incorporated into the public school system in 1881, but he felt that they would be useful in the less fortunate areas of the city. In Lowell, the Superintendent went to great pains to differentiate between good homes where mothers would exercise supervision over the children and thus make early schooling unnecessary and homes where parents worked, children failed to attend school, and illiteracy was prominent; homes which would benefit from early childhood schools. Lynn's Superintendent pleaded for just one kindergarten especially adapted to "little ones from homes of the poor and the uncared for." The school committee in New Bedford, arguing for kindergartens, believed that "the great majority of children who do not attend school between five and seven are unfortunately those of foreign parentage, and, as a rule, often of the most ignorant kind. They are the very children who should be in school at the earliest permissible age, as they, as a rule, are the first to leave school to go to work." In Cambridge: "The value of these schools [kindergartens] cannot be estimated by their cost. They mean to many a child the difference between a happy useful life, and one of wretchedness if not of crime." Two years later, in 1897, the Cambridge School Committee reported that the city's kindergartens had aimed to supply the most needy parts of the city. That same year, the new Superintendent of Schools in Haverhill wrote: "In my opinion the Kindergarten should be established not for the benefit of those children who come from homes of culture and refinement; but on the contrary, it should receive those children that have had little, if any good home-training. If it were established in such a portion of our city, and were properly conducted, it would furnish a happy transition from those homes and the unwholesome influences of street life to the healthful schoolroom surroundings."[29]

These views were not isolated phenomena. They reflected a growing sense of urgency about the relationship of education and schools to slum life, manifest to some extent in almost all the educational innovations of the late nineteenth century. Schooling and social welfare were becoming synonymous as educators desperately sought to correct the dysfunctional institutions of the urban environment. It was thus not surprising that out of the social reform movements of the late nineteenth century, settlement houses, philanthropists, and educators should discover a common sense of identity and mission, should find in the kindergarten a way of uniting the home and the child with the larger society.

Educators committed to the kindergarten frequently noted and applauded the activities of settlement workers and philanthropists, and indeed, were quick to point out that the latter had supported innovations in childhood education before the teaching profession. In Massachusetts and across the country, the first kindergartens had been established for the children of affluence, but, as the Secretary of the Massachusetts State Board of Education put it, the wealthy quickly took up the "missionary enterprise" which "sees in the kindergarten an ideal way of reaching not only the children of poverty but through them the homes from which they come." Philanthropists found the kindergarten an ideal means of child-saving at a time when child and home care began to dominate social welfare concerns. The prominent Boston philanthropists, Annie A. Fields, declared "Let us take the little child in the future from its possibly ignorant, filthy, careless mother, as soon as it can walk. . . and give it three hours daily in the kindergarten, where during that time it will be made clean, will enjoy light, color, order, music, and the sweet influence of a living and self-controlled voice." Boston's leading social worker, Robert A. Woods, trumpeted the benefits to be derived from the kindergarten, while Joseph Lee, the founder of the National Recreation League, member of the Boston School Committee, and leading philanthropist emphasized the unity and commonality of the kindergarten and social reform.[30]

---

[29] Lawrence, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1881, p. 40; Lowell, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1880, pp. 22-23; Ibid., 1881, pp. 10-12; Lynn, School Report, 1892, p. 51; New Bedford, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1902, p. 26; Cambridge, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1895, p. 48; Ibid., 1897, p. 43; Haverhill, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1897, p. 29 (Hereafter reports of superintendents of schools and school committees will be cited as School Report.)

So pervasive was the idea that kindergartens and social work were integral to one another that when Laura Fisher, Director of Boston's public school kindergartens, attempted to summarize developments in the field of childhood education at the beginning of the twentieth century, she focused on the role of philanthropy:

> Centering among, and concerning itself with, the children of the poor, and having for its aim the elevation of the home, it was natural that the kindergarten as a philanthropic movement should win great and early favor. The mere fact that the children of the slums were kept off the streets, and that they were made clean and happy by kind and motherly young women; that the child thus being cared for enabled the mother to go about her work in or outside the home--all this appealed to the heart of America, and America gave freely to make these kindergartens possible. Churches established

---

[30] Vandewalker, Kindergarten, pp. 1-2; Kindergarten News, 3: 1/93, 5; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1897-98, p. 197; Fields is quoted in Hugins, "Private Charity," p. 111; Robert A. Woods, The City Wilderness (Boston, 1898), p. 237; Joseph Lee, "Kindergarten Principles in Social Work," NEA, Proceedings, 1903, 378-82. See also, Elizabeth Harrison, "The Growth of the Kindergarten in the United States," in International Kindergarten Union, Pioneers of the Kindergarten, p. 10; Journal of Education, 39: 3/8/94, 149.

> kindergartens for the poor of the parish, individuals endowed kindergartens, and associations were organized for the spread and support of kindergartens in nearly every large city. . . As college and social settlements appeared on the horizon they adopted the kindergarten, looking upon it as a valuable means for building their clubs for children and women and as the nucleus for district work.

In her comments, Miss Fisher touched on most of the relevant features of the philanthropic kindergarten movement: the recognition of poverty, the multiplicity of organizations concerned with the child, a desire to benefit the individual child, and the broader aims of elevating the home and the neighborhood through the child.[31]

It was the latter features of the kindergarten, however, which most interested the settlements. The kindergarten was seen as another means of bringing an urban district's diverse population into harmony. As the settlement sought to improve society by melting families into a neighborhood, so the kindergartens would harmonize individual families. Proposing a club for little children along kindergarten lines, one Boston settlement worker wrote, "They would be easy to manage, and would give us an entrée into the homes of the mothers." While settlements would elevate the neighborhood through art, literature, music, and the other refinements of a cultured society, so too would the kindergartens elevate the home. Settlements and kindergartens gave the highest priority to taking the child off the streets by providing him with attractions unattainable on them. Both viewed the poor, particularly the immigrant poor, with a mixture of sympathy and contempt. Kindergarten teachers, the Pittsfield, Massachusetts Sun wrote in 1898, would explain their methods and objects, teach the games and songs to mothers, thus allowing mothers to play with their children at home. And, "if the mothers happen to be poor, ignorant, uncultivated women, as so many are who have children in the public or free kindergartens, the kindergartner does real missionary work in the talks she can give on hygiene--proper food and clothing and neatness in every way. . . ." Mothers' meetings, kindergartner Nora Smith argued, for those "hard-worked, unlettered women" whose children attended the charity kindergarten classes, should be social gatherings in spotless rooms containing flowers, light refreshments, and cloth-covered tables. "It will be," she wrote, "a cosmopolitan audience thus gathered together in any of our free kindergartens, and somewhat uncongenial in its elements, comprising, as it does, Italians, Germans, French, Irish, Scandanavians, Hebrews, Africans, a few native-born Americans possibly, and perhaps even some wanderers from Syria or Armenia." None, however, would be too foreign to benefit from the lessons in child rearing the kindergarten teacher would provide. Kindergartners could even see in the settlement simply an extension of themselves, terming it a "kindergarten for adults." "The settlement may not have intentionally preached the doctrines of Froebel, but it has practiced them in every phase of its work. In the playground, the children's club, the vacation school, nay, in the very settlement itself, one may read the philosophy of the kindergarten writ large."[32]

---

[31] Laura Fisher, "The Kindergarten," U. S. Bureau of Education, Annual Report of the Commissioner, 1904, pp. 692.

Yet both kindergartners and settlement workers often overlooked an essential tension between the two. The former were always torn between focusing on the child as an entity unto himself, thus looking toward a future society of adults previously trained in the kindergarten, or using the child as a means of uplifting the home and thereby seeking more immediate relief of social ills. The latter represented the social settlement phase of the kindergarten movement. Mothers' meetings, visits to the homes of kindergarten children, concern for the physical and moral needs of the families of the children were analogous to the neighborhood building aspirations of social workers like Robert A. Woods. The city, Woods believed, had destroyed the sense of attachment which existed in small town America. It had separated its inhabitants by class, race, and religion, and forced individual families into isolation. To overcome the consequences of urbanization, Woods devoted his life to neighborhood building, the only unit of urban society within which family life could adequately develop. Through the settlement house, he hoped to provide all the functions of life normally performed in the home or which could no longer be performed there, thereby seeking "to rehabilitate home and neighborhood life. . . ." At the same time, Woods advocated a closer relationship between the neighborhood school and the children's homes, turning particularly to the kindergarten as one important means of accomplishing this. He advocated its extension through the public schools and philanthropy, and participated in what was probably the most dramatic attempt to integrate the kindergarten and social work, the establishment of Elizabeth Peabody House in Boston's West End district on April 21, 1896--the anniversary of Froebel's birthday.[33]

---

[32] Denison House Papers, folder 3, diary, 1/6/93, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; Alan F. Davis, *Spearheads for Reform: The Social Settlements and the Progressive Movement*, 1890-1914 (New York, 1967), pp. 43-45; Arthur Mann, *Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age* (New York, 1966), pp. 115-23; The Pittsfield *Sun* article can be found in *Kindergarten Review*, 4: 10/98, 118-21; Smith, *Children*, pp. 52-55; Vandewalker, *Kindergarten*, pp. 108-11.

---

[33] John Laun, "Robert A. Woods: Architect of the Intra-Urban Village," History honors thesis, Harvard University, 1963, pp. 1-5, 24-26, passim; Mann, Yankee Reformers, pp. 115-23; Woods, City Wilderness, pp. 3, 237-42.

Under the motto "A Little Child Shall Lead Them," and asking the question "Can the moral life of a neighborhood be elevated by work concentrated upon the youngest children and mothers?", the new settlement attracted Boston's leading educators, social workers, philanthropists, and kindergartners. Its first Board of Directors included Dr. Samuel Eliot, former superintendent of Boston's public schools and Frank A. Hill, Secretary of the State Board of Education. From the field of social work came Robert Woods, from philanthropy Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw. Representing the kindergartners were Laliah Pingree, former associate supervisor of Mrs. Shaw's charity kindergartens and chairman of the Boston School Board's committee on kindergartens; Laura Fisher, director of the public school kindergartens, and Lucy Wheelock, founder of a school for training kindergarten teachers. The close relationship between social work and education in Massachusetts exemplified by Peabody House was epitomized by Mrs. Eva Whiting White who became head worker at Elizabeth Peabody House in 1909, and subsequently was a member of the State Board of Education, director of the Extended Use of the Public Schools committee of the Boston School Board, and an associate of the Boston School for Social Workers.[34]

Peabody House considered itself in an ideal location: "The street swarms with little children, only partly cared for by the public schools." The area's houses had until recently been owned by Boston's upper classes, and even now, the first Annual Report noted, "the majority of the houses do not flaunt their poverty, wickedness, and misery." The surrounding population included Italians, Russian Jews, and a few Irish, but was in the process of becoming almost entirely Jewish. Within weeks of its opening, the House's optimism appeared justified. Response to the free kindergarten classes overwhelmed the limited resources and forced a maximum class size of 30 children for the first summer, a number retained for at least three years. Two years later, the settlement's work continued to confirm the need for kindergartens: "Although the value of a kindergarten in a neighborhood such as ours can hardly be over-estimated, the public kindergartens here are entirely inadequate to the number of children." At the same time, however, Peabody House was enlarging its conception of itself. Kindergartens were essential, but they were also insufficient for true neighborhood building. Teaching small children alone could not revitalize areas of poverty. Expanding upon kindergartens, Peabody House opened clubs for former kindergarten children, commenced evening classes for adults, established reading and kitchen garden clubs, history talks and debates, sponsored a general open house on Friday evenings, and proposed that manual training be incorporated into its regular activities. Indeed, by the turn of the century, especially after the transfer of the House to Boston's Ward 8 in 1901, a considerably poorer and newer immigrant district whose foreign inhabitants meant "weakness" and "danger" to the city, the kindergarten settlement increasingly took on the appearance of a regular settlement house. By 1901, the House's reports talked less about the kindergarten as a unique institution, and more about the settlement as the "common meeting place" of the neighborhood. In the hands of the people at Peabody House, the kindergarten thus became the foundation upon which a superstructure of social service activities was built. Committed to the kindergarten as an agent of social amelioration and reform, though frequently hostile to the institutions it sought to improve, Peabody House expanded its programs, identifying early childhood education with intergenerational needs. That decision to view the child as a member of a family and community revealed the fundamental tenet of the social settlement phase of the kindergarten movement.[35]

---

[34] Elizabeth Peabody House, Annual Report, 1903, p. 4; ibid., 1910, p. 20; ibid., 1912, p. 16.

## II

Tied to and invigorated by the settlement house movement, the kindergarten soon found its way into the public school systems of urban Massachusetts. By 1914, seven of the ten largest cities and twelve of the twenty largest had public kindergartens. In almost every case, they developed out of a philanthropic base, and particularly in the first years of the transition from charity to public education continued their allegiance to the ideals of social philanthropy.[36] Almost invariably, the first kindergartens under public auspices focused on the peculiar needs of the slum child, and upon the role kindergartens could play in elevating the home and neighborhood. Nonetheless, the incorporation of early childhood training into urban school systems reflected a withdrawal from the broad goals of community reform, and revealed an emerging consensus among educators and philanthropists that all education, whatever its social justification, should be centered in the schools. In the case of Massachusetts kindergartens, this would lead in the decades after 1900 to a gradual narrowing, rather than broadening, of social commitments. As we shall see, for reasons of economy and theory, public kindergartens began to eliminate mothers' meetings and home visits, while their supporters on the eve of World War I spoke less about reforming and elevating the family and about social amelioration than they did about smoothing the child's progress in grade school and separating him from his social background. The processes of transfer from philanthropic to public, and the need for an institutional rationale acceptable to the professional educator worked a subtle but nonetheless radical transformation in the philosophy of the kindergarten. These themes were well exemplified by developments in Massachusetts' capital city.

---

[35] Ibid., 1896, pp. 3-5; ibid., 1898, pp. 5-8; ibid., 1900, p. 9; ibid., 1902, pp. 7-8; ibid., 1904, pp. 12-14; ibid., 1907, pp. 16, 22; ibid., 1910, pp. 12-13. See also, Caroline F. Brown, "Elizabeth Peabody House: The Kindergarten Settlement in Boston," Kindergarten Review, 12: 10/01, 63-67; Journal of Education, 44: 7/22/97, 52; Eva Whiting White, "Elizabeth Peabody House and the Immigrant," Immigration, 3: 2/1912, 240-45.

[36] For a general summary of kindergarten developments in Massachusetts and New England, see Lucy Wheelock, editor, "The Kindergarten in New England," presented to the Association for Childhood Education, June 26-30, 1935, ms. in Wheelock Papers, Wheelock College. Of the 10 largest Massachusetts cities, Boston, Worcestor, Fall River, Lowell, Cambridge, Springfield, and Somerville had public kindergartens, while New Bedford, Lynn, and Lawrence did not. Of the next 10 cities, Holyoke, Haverhill, Salem, Newton, and Fitchburg had classes. Brockton, Malden, Taunton, Everett, and Quincy did not.

Late nineteenth century Boston was almost a microcosm of the best and worst of American life. The city's philanthropists, its intellectuals and religious leaders seemed embodiments of the social reform movements sweeping the country, while its politics, immigration problems, and class and religious strife imbued it with a pervasive odor of corruption and fragmentation. Internally separated by the Anglophilism of the fashionable Back Bay, the dreariness of the working class South End, and the poverty and seeming anarchy of the immigrant North End, the city was a series of almost independent urban villages tied together by a complex network of political bosses and established families. Seeking to purify the environment in which they lived, Boston's philanthropists identified themselves as social reformers, providing, in the case of education, the impetus for almost all innovations in the city's public school system. In turn, Boston set the tone for public education in other parts of the state, or as the Lowell School Committee commented, "We are all in a procession, and the Boston schools head the procession."[37]

---

[37] Mann, Yankee Reformers, pp. 1-23; Lowell, School Report, 1876, p. 13.

As early as 1867, a citizens' group of prominent philanthropists headed by Elizabeth Peabody formally requested the Boston School Committee to establish a kindergarten at public expense. Although rebuffed, the petitioners returned a year later, this time to better avail, gaining the Board's support for an experimental kindergarten to begin in 1870. The School Committee's report on the possibilities of kindergarten education revealed both its debt to Peabody's proselytizing and its need to justify formal and distinctive educational institutions for young children. The kindergarten, the Committee wrote, "is not a mere place for play."

> Recognizing the fact that curiosity, the desire to handle things, to become acquainted with the outward world, are among the first impulses of the young child, the instructor conforms his teaching thereto. Instead of giving the pupil a book treating of abstractions in which he can as yet feel no interest, he presents to him objects which more or less pique his curiosity, appeal to his fancy, task his invention. This and not mere amusement is the intent of the blocks, balls, sticks, curved wires, pricked cards and boxes of cubes and triangles which are placed before him. They are his first-lesson books.[38]

Elaborating the standard arguments which Peabody and others had been articulating for a decade, the report contended that the activities of the kindergarten would quicken the child's powers of observation and analytic skills, implant habits of attention, order and self control, and increase his industriousness, all within a context of freedom of interest. Beyond the child's gains stood those of the public primary and grammar schools: ". . . It seems to us that the habits, mental and moral, which the Kindergarten tends to form, will constitute a better preparation for subsequent entrance into the Primary and Grammar school than that which most children will acquire elsewhere."

---

[38] Boston, School Report, 1869, pp. 5-6; ibid., 1887, pp. 18-19; Fanny Johnson, "History of the Kindergarten Movement in Boston," Kindergarten Review, 12: 4/02, 475.

Finally, turning to a theme which would appear more frequently in the years to come, the Committee stated that the kindergarten would help answer the question, "How shall we educate those who, leaving school at 14 or 15 years of age, will have to get their living by the labor of their hands?" For these children, the rudiments of manual skills taught in the kindergarten would provide an early preparation for future labor, surpassing any other school experience. With these conclusions, the School Committee established a kindergarten for 1870, but one which served children from well-to-do homes.[39]

During the next decade, despite acknowledgment by all parties that the experimental kindergarten, which annually averaged between 14 and 35 pupils, had proven a success, Boston did not expand its public support. Partly, this was the result of conflict between the School Board and the City Council and broader political controversy over reform of the School Committee. But more important were an unwillingness on the part of school administrators to engage in extensive and often expensive educational innovation and the inability of kindergarten supporters to dramatize the necessity for early childhood schooling, especially for slum children. Within two years of the model kindergarten's establishment, Superintendent of Schools John Philbrick suggested that Boston's primary schools were already performing much of the kindergarten's functions, though he believed the experiment was worth expanding to three or four additional classes. Until his ouster in 1878, Philbrick continued to provide lukewarm support for the kindergarten, but he did claim in 1874 that the class's success with pupils from affluent homes "where the advantages of the best home care and influence" were available was not a valid test of the system's possibilities. "If the Kindergarten School is needed anywhere, it is among the poorer children whose parents have neither the time nor the intelligence for their proper care and training. Before it can be said that the Kindergarten has had a fair trial here, we ought to have one or more experimental schools of this description accessible to the children of the poorer classes of parents." In the absence of such a test, Philbrick believed, it was better to close the single existing school.[40]

---

[39] Boston, School Report, pp. 6-7; ibid., 1874, p. 213; Philbrick, "The New Departure," p. 116.

Philbrick's proposal that the kindergarten be extended to children of the poor received the support of the School Committee and the philanthropists already working to establish kindergartens in the slum. Its subsequent rejection by the city's Common Council, however, while mildly disconcerting to the Committee, which had other concerns, was particularly unsettling to the philanthropists. In an open letter to the "Citizens of Boston," a group that had been running two charity kindergartens in the immigrant North End condemned the Council for refusing to appropriate public funds for the education of children under six, with the exception of the already extablished class. "In making this exception the Common Council seem to have thought themselves indulging the whim of a few enthusiasts instead of appreciating intelligently the system of Froebel" or the existing widespread support for Froebel's ideas. To charges that kindergarten education, demanding one teacher for every 25 children, was absurdly expensive in comparison to the 56 pupils for every primary school teacher, the philanthropists responded that savings of police and prison funds gained by channeling young children from the streets to kindergartens would more than compensate for costs. "But this great thing and most necessary thing will not be done in Boston without a general uprising of conscience and energy of the voters, who in choosing the Common Council, should see to it that the candidates are wide awake on this subject. Kindergartens should be required by the people of the city government." The letter concluded by asking that every paper in Boston print the appeal and that "every reader of it bestir himself and herself to secure the voters."[41]

---

[40] Boston, School Report, 1871, pp. 347-55; ibid., 1872, pp. 214-216; ibid., 1874, pp. 213-214, 368-70; ibid., 1875, pp. 29-30; ibid., 1876, p. 80; ibid., 1877, pp. 124-28; ibid., 1879, p. 7; New England Journal of Education, 1: 1/23/75, 37 and 2: 9/18/75, 126.

All of this, however, was to little avail. The kindergarten's cost remained a concern of the Council as well as the School Board, while the idea of distinctively slum classes supported by public funds appeared to make little headway. With the organization of a new school administration in 1878-79, even the experimental kindergarten was dropped, despite vigorous remonstrances from its supporters. The School Committee retreated to an earlier position of its now former Superintendent of Schools and declared that since funds were unavailable to extend the classes to all parts of the city, one or a few kindergartens were unjust and unwise "without a more general and pronounced demand on the part of the public." The new Superintendent, Samuel Eliot, probably reflected a wider feeling when he concluded that the kindergarten was better suited to private charity than public support."[42]

Indeed, Eliot's remarks provided a key insight into the development of kindergartens in Boston, for by 1879 the city possessed a rather complete network of philanthropic charity schools, financed almost entirely by Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw. Daughter of famed Harvard scientist Louis Agassiz, stepdaughter of Radcliffe College's first president, Elizabeth Cary Agassiz, and wife of a copper mining heir who claimed three of Massachusetts' most distinguished names, Mrs. Shaw epitomized the socially concerned philanthropist. In the last year of her life, she wrote her children that she had "had too much--you will all have too much--and it will require great effort with God's help to determine 'to give' rather than 'to hold'. . . ." Kindergarten Review believed Mrs. Shaw was the "means of social salvation to thousands upon thousands, and has done not a little toward establishing the kingdom of love and righteousness upon the earth," while the Boston Evening Transcript considered her "Boston's greatest woman philanthropist." At the time of her death in 1917, she was a major contributor to settlement houses in the Boston area, a strong supporter of women's rights, and founder and president of the Boston Equal Suffrage Association. Many of the educational innovations of the period--Sloyd (a Swedish method of woodworking), industrial education, and vocational placement bureaus--received their initial support from her proselytizing and financial activities. But of all her concerns, none so involved her interest and money as the kindergarten and day nurseries, believing that "the bringing up of children is the vital question of life--the great problem of the race."[43]

---

[41] "Kindergartens: The Need of Their Establishment and Support --An Appeal to the Citizens of Boston," [1874-75?], printed copy of letter in Harvard College Library.

[42] Boston, School Report, 1879, pp. 7-9, 65-66.

Unfortunately, the processes of Mrs. Shaw's involvement with kindergartners are somewhat unclear. Before her marriage, she had apparently aided her stepmother at the latter's school for girls in Cambridge, a school which undoubtedly reflected the liberalized educational theories of the university city's educated classes. Sometime in the 1860's, in order to provide for the education of her five children, she established a private school for them and their friends. It is probable that at this time she became acquainted with Elizabeth Peabody, and became converted to the latter's faith in the kindergarten, for in 1870 when Peabody's school appeared ready to close for lack of funds, Mrs. Shaw came to its rescue. Shortly thereafter she helped open a charity kindergarten in Boston's North End, followed by two similar ones in suburban Jamaica Plain and Brookline. Within a decade, she was supporting 31 such ventures in and around Boston, spending more than $200,000 on them between 1882 and 1889. Even after her kindergartens were incorporated into the Boston public school system in 1888, she continued to provide funds for kindergarten training courses for teachers, Christmas parties, and an assortment of related activities.[44]

---

[43] Pauline Shaw to "My Dear Children," 11/30/16, Women's Rights Collection, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; Kindergarten Review, 12: 3/02, 400, 415; Boston Evening Transcript, 2/10/17, copy in Schlesinger Library. For biographical information on Mrs. Shaw, see Women's Rights Collection, folders 1042-45, Schlesinger Library; Alexandra Pierce, "Pauline Agassiz Shaw," typed essay, 1959, ibid.; Pauline Agassiz Shaw: Tributes Paid Her Memory (Boston, 1917). The Journal of Education considered Mrs. Shaw the "richest woman in Boston." 14: 9/29/81, 205.

The most famous of Mrs. Shaw's charity kindergartens were undoubtedly those in Boston's densely populated North End. Here at the edge of the harbor and encompassing such artifacts of the city's colonial heritage as North Church and Paul Revere's House arrived Boston's newest immigrants. By 1900, 25 nationalities, most recently arrived from East Europe, would make the district the most foreign and poorest in the city. "Its houses are crowded with Poles, Russians, Italians, Bohemians, and peoples of all lands," wrote Francis Parker, former supervisor of primary schools in the North End. "Hundreds of parents turn their children out into the streets in the morning to care for themselves, while they, by selling fruit, grinding organs, begging, or even worse, strive to eke out a miserable existence." To meet the needs of these children, two charity kindergartens had been established in the early 1870's, "to collect", its sponsors wrote, "some of the neglected children who swarm in the streets, while yet too young for the primary schools, and give them facilities for intellectual and moral training at an age most tender and sensitive to every surrounding influence."[45]

---

[44] Pauline Agassiz Shaw: Tributes, pp. 32-36; Journal of Education, 27: 4/26/88, 264; Kindergarten Magazine, 2: 12/89, 248.

It is unclear how long these schools remained in existence, but by 1880, Mrs. Shaw had helped establish at least three separate kindergarten classes, receiving permission from the Boston School Committee to hold two of them in rooms of a local public school. All furnishings, heat, teachers, and assistants were paid for by Mrs. Shaw, the classes catering to children between 22 months and five years of age. Physical needs were met first, each child being greeted by daily face washing, his clothes cleaned, and milk and bread provided. The kindergarten room, one observer of a North End class wrote, "is warm and cheery; bright pictures hang on the walls; on one blackboard is a crayon sketch of swans floating on still waters; on another are notes and words of simple songs; on the shelves at one side of the room is a company of dolls, while various childish treasures are scattered here and there within easy reach of tiny hands." The activities of these classes in the heart of the immigrant ghetto had a certain bizarre quality to them. Children marched and sang about becoming a "little birdie"; they learned that wooden balls come from "the great, tall trees" and talked about pussy willows, the sun, and walks in green fields. Committed to memory were such verses as:

---

[45] Francis W. Parker, "The Kindergartens of Boston," Kindergarten Magazine, 1: 3/89, 334-35; "Kindergartens: The Need of Their Establishment."

I'm an oriole, I'm an oriole,
My nest hangs on high,
Where the breezes are singing
Their sweet lullaby.
They rock in their cradle,
My birdies and me,
And we are as happy,
As happy can be.[46]

But the North End kindergartens were more than play spots dedicated to introducing rural imagery into the life of the ghetto child. Both Mrs. Shaw and her supervising teacher, Laliah Pingree, were devoted to reaching the neighboring homes. Mothers were invited into the classes, parents' gatherings were held in the evenings to explain kindergarten methods and to suggest improvement in child care. The kindergartners placed great faith in the belief that habits of children learned while under their care would pervade the slum home. They were enthusiastic about such tales as Lucy Wheelock's "A Lily's Mission" which told of a flower received by two "ragged, dirty children" whose brightness when they brought it home convinced their mother to clean her house and their father to stop drinking. Forced to overcome apathy among parents toward the new classes, kindergarten teachers systematically and consistently visited the homes of enrolled and prospective pupils. In defense of these activities, Miss Pingree wrote that "the interest manifested in the children and families does much to encourage the parents to do something for the children themselves, and to make them more responsible for them. The impression made upon the mothers by the patience and gentleness of the teachers is a deep one. . . ." Like the settlements, the charity kindergartens placed themselves in the neighborhood and sought through the child to influence the family.[47]

---

[46] Alice M. Guernsey, "Schools and Homes," Journal of Education, 18: 7/12/83, 53; Parker, "Kindergartens of Boston," p. 335. On the use of public school classrooms for Mrs. Shaw's kindergartens, see Boston School Committee, Minutes, 1882, pp. 218-19.

Mrs. Shaw's North End classes epitomized the charity concept of kindergarten education, and they, and the others she financed, were acceptable to the Boston School Committee which regularly allowed her to use public school facilities, provided she met all costs. By the middle of the 1880's, however, Mrs. Shaw was forced to cut back her commitment due to rising costs, and those associated with her began pressuring the School Committee to finance its own kindergartens. Moreover, while pressure was applied from outside the school system, Superintendent of Schools Edwin P. Seaver pressed from within. In his 1885 Report, Seaver noted that Mrs. Shaw's 17 Boston kindergartens were providing instruction to almost 1,000 children. "Although these kindergartens form no part of the public school system," he wrote, "their relation to that system is important in many ways. In some localities they prepare whole classes for the primary schools; in all localities they furnish practical exemplifications of Froebel's educational principles. . . ." Quoting Laliah Pingree, supervisor of Mrs. Shaw's classes, Seaver noted the growing regularity of attendance among the children, and the success kindergarten teachers had achieved in improving child care during their home visits. Miss Pingree continued: "These little ones often come to us so degraded and almost depraved, from constant association with vice of every kind, lawless and defiant, using profane language with the ease of full-grown men, untruthful, sullen, and unhappy, but gradually. . . habits of honesty, truthfulness, and obedience have been formed, impure language hushed, and some degree of gentleness and kindness towards others has been gained. . . ." Seaver hardly added more to Pingree's assertions, and he concluded his report by declaring:

---

[47] Laliah Pingree quoted in Boston, School Documents, 1885, #4, pp. 51-52; Lucy Wheelock, "A Lily's Mission," Voice from the Old Brewery and Five Points Mission Monthly (published by Ladies Home Missionary Society), 10/1/89, copy in Wheelock Papers, Wheelock College. Similar to the Wheelock story is Annie I. Willis, "A Midsummer Story: The Charity Kindergarten," Journal of Education, 36: 7/14/92, 55-57.

> There is no doubt in my mind that our school system would gain very much in efficiency if there were thoroughly good kindergartens in every district, through which all young children should pass before entering the primary schools. . . .As it is now, the advantages of the kindergarten are obscured, and in some measure lost, because the kindergarten children are mingled with other children not from kindergartens. . . No doubt something has been gained. . . by imbuing the teaching in the lower grades of the primary schools with the spirit and methods of the kindergarten. This is the great reason why the School Committee has been right in treating the free kindergartens with encouragement and hospitality. But the next great step forward is to recognize and establish the kindergarten as a part of the system of public instruction.

The issue, he believed, had become simply one of finances, and he implied that the School Committee should turn itself to that.[48]

Again in 1886 and 1887, Seaver urged public kindergartens upon the city. Of Boston's 13,000 children ages four and five, 3,000 were in schools. "What a blessing to the many homes if the other 10,000 could be placed in good kindergartens!" Defending kindergartens against criticism as merely places to play, he declared: "What appears to be play in the kindergarten exercise is not mere play; it is like play in its spontaneity, but it is under rational guidance and control. . . ." Even finances had now diminished as an issue, since other considerations outweighed expense, and in light of St. Louis and Philadelphia whose public kindergartens had been enormous educational successes without undue cost.[49]

---

[48] Boston, School Documents, 1885, #4, pp. 50-54. Pingree's letter included an intriguing insight into a possible effect of the kindergarten upon parent-child relationships. After being struck by her mother, a child reportedly responded, "God did not give you those to strike me with; he made them to do nice and kind things; my [kindergarten] teacher said so." Ibid., pp. 51-52.

Seaver's position was greatly strengthened when Mrs. Shaw decided to intervene publicly in the debate. In an open letter to the School Committee on May 10, 1887, she referred to the success of her free kindergartens, urged an investigation "to ascertain the value of this system in connection with our public schools," and offered to turn over her kindergartens to the city. The subsequent report of a committee of the School Board represented a complete victory for Seaver and Shaw. "When Mrs. Shaw entered upon the work which she now commends to the consideration of the School Committee," the report began, "some of those interested in it regarded it as more suited to private than to public maintenance." But Mrs. Shaw's classes had proven of overwhelming benefit to the city; her charity had undertaken an experiment in education and had succeeded. Moreover, the committee found, the city of Philadelphia had recently taken over its charity kindergartens with great success, an example which Boston could well follow.[50]

It was on the theme, however, of the applicability of kindergarten education to further schooling that the committee fixed, and the report thus tried, with only moderate success, to disassociate kindergartens from their charity backgrounds. The notion that kindergartens were simply day nurseries for children of the poor, for example, was explicitly denied. Similarly, though there existed many homes "in a city like ours. . . incapable of making any real approach to similar influences over their younger members," even the best homes could benefit from kindergarten training. More to the point, since Boston's working class children left school at age 14 without completing their grammar school education, the kindergarten would provide them with an additional year's schooling. And, it would not add "time alone." "Its character as a means of more training, to say nothing of its distinctive work with the senses and the hands of the pupil, tells strongly upon his education in the very direction where the great body of our children most need to be educated." The onus of the charity kindergarten, then, could be overcome by expanding formal early childhood education from the poor to the working class.[51]

---

[49] Ibid., 1886, #3, pp. 46-49; ibid., 1887, #3, pp. 28-32.

[50] The text of Mrs. Shaw's letter is included in the committee's report. Ibid., 1887, #21, pp. 3-5.

Considerably more impressive than the working class argument was that provided by a survey of Boston's first grade teachers. In response to a questionnaire on the effects of kindergarten training, the teachers overwhelmingly supported such instruction. Not all expressed enthusiasm, but even those who opposed public kindergartens often did so for reasons which aided the advocates of liberalized teaching methods. One teacher, for example, with 25 years experience wrote, ". . . I object to children coming from Kindergarten schools, because they are so much at home, and it is very hard to bring them to the order expected in the public schools. . . I think it cruel to send a child to a Kindergarten, and then send it to a school where the teacher is obliged to be a martinet, and where there are between fifty and sixty pupils." This teacher, however, praised the kindergarten as a separate institution; her criticism applied to its incompatibility with the presently organized public schools. Others, more critical of the kindergarten methods themselves, condemned them for producing talkative and unruly children who demanded too much individual attention. Yet these arguments clearly represented a minority of the respondents. A teacher with 26 years' experience, who had received 12 to 15 kindergarten children annually for the past eight years, believed them more perceptive and better able to write and draw than children coming directly from home. Another found kindergarten children from foreign-speaking families entered first grade significantly advanced in their use of English. Other teachers claimed that children without kindergartens took longer to adjust to school, thereby wasting time better spent in learning the curriculum. These views in support of the kindergarten were probably best summarized by the following comment from an experienced teacher:

---

[51] Ibid., pp. 6-10.

> I have taught Primary School thirty-two years--beginners about twenty years--began to receive children from Kindergartens about ten years ago--think I have received ten or twelve each year. I have a clear impression as to the effect of Kindergarten training. Children from Kindergartens have received a training in habits of neatness, cleanliness, order, self-reliance, and prompt obedience, which is a great saving of time to the Primary teacher. They have also formed habits of observing closely, and using their hands properly. All their faculties have been so cultivated that no time is lost in preparing them for Primary School work. Children belonging to cultivated families who can have a judicious mother's careful training, in my opinion do not need a Kindergarten; but it is almost a necessity for the majority of children under our charge. I consider the moral training which the Kindergarten gives to children of an almost priceless value. We who have from fifty-six to sixty or more children cannot so carefully watch each little one, learn its peculiar traits, temperament, etc., as should be done during the first months of school life. Kindergarten teachers do much in this direction. I think the training in habits of truthfulness, unselfishness, and thoughtfulness for the rights of others of untold value to the children, and a great assistance to the Primary teacher.[52]

To Superintendent Seaver, these affirmative statements clinched the argument. The kindergarten, he concluded, dramatically improved the child's intellectual and academic achievements, heightened his sense of justice and cooperative enterprise, and thereby enhanced the probability of his future success in school. The chief point of contention between the kindergarten advocates and their opponents--the issue of discipline--he believed lay in a perversion of ideals, the result of occasional unguided play in the kindergarten and the repressive atmosphere of some primary classes. More intimate association between kindergartners and primary school teachers would soon resolve the conflict. Ultimately, however, the dynamic behind the kindergarten was less its possible impact on school achievement than its position as an antagonist of urban life. For children too young to attend primary school, the kindergarten "affords a much-needed protection from the injurious influences of the street." "For those unfortunate children--and they are many," Seaver concluded, "who suffer from parental carelessness, indifference, ignorance, or poverty, the Kindergarten measurably supplies what the home does not--kindly nurture in the virtues and graces of a more refined and elevated democratic life."[53]

---

[52] Ibid., pp. 11-27. Of the 99 teachers who responded, 86 were affirmative for the kindergarten. One hundred and one teachers either failed to respond or claimed no acquaintance with the kindergarten trained children.

Within a year the Boston School Committee had adopted the kindergarten as part of its public school system, taking over 15 existing charity schools, in what Seaver considered the most important step the Boston schools had taken for a generation. This adoption, while it heralded future changes, particularly with regard to city-wide expansion and the formalization of practices, did not mean an immediate revision of the kindergarten's philanthropic goals. In 1892, the School Committee, noting the moral uplift the kindergartens provided, declared: "Out of homes of poverty and wretchedness and sin, in hundreds of cases, these little ones are taken, to be given their first lesson in neatness and cleanliness and order. . . If the citizens of Boston could visit these schools, they would realize more and more their influence for good, and the power they are to have when they become universal, in helping solve some of the great questions which are pressing upon us in our great cities." Two years later, Kindergarten News reported that Boston's public kindergartens were profiting from the economic depression. "In the poorer districts a great many parents have not been able to keep their homes as comfortable as before, and they were glad to send their children where they would be warm and receive proper care." "In a very quiet way," the article continued, "the teachers, and particularly those at the north end, have rendered aid in cases of destitution, or else instructed parents how to proceed to procure assistance." In the 1890's, close observers could find little to distinguish the charity and public school kindergartens.[54]

---

[53] Ibid., pp. 27-28.

The themes which predominated in the development of the Boston kindergartens--philanthropic initiation, applicability to ghetto life, transferral of philanthropic ideals to the public schools--also appeared in a number of other Massachusetts cities, though rarely as clearly or as completely. In Cambridge, for example, a city whose economic and social structure closely resembled Boston's, kindergartens were also initiated by Mrs. Shaw in the late 1870's. A decade later, almost simultaneous with the movement in Boston, she and other philanthropists urged the Cambridge School Committee to incorporate their charity classes into the public schools. Following a brief study by the Board, and citing growing affirmation of public kindergartens in cities like Philadelphia and Boston, and in neighboring Newton and Brookline, Cambridge adopted the four existing philanthropic ventures in 1889. With the addition of two more kindergarten classes the next year, early childhood education became a prominent part of the public school system, although conflict between the School Committee and the City Council in 1891 produced a momentary shortage of funds. As had occurred in Boston, philanthropy, particularly in the form of kindergarten vacation schools, continued to play a role in the classes even after their adoption by the public system. In addition, mothers' clubs, evening receptions for fathers, and home visits by teachers remained integral to Cambridge's kindergarten program through to the end of the century.[55]

---

[54] Ibid., 1888, #28, pp. 10-13; ibid., 1892, #21, p. 24; Kindergarten News, 4: 4/94, 135.

Similarly, the distinction between public and private responsibility which had been blurred in Boston even after the kindergartens became parts of the public school system occurred in other Massachusetts cities. Where public classes did not exist, as in Brockton, charity tended to supply at least part of the need. In North Plymouth, a particular variant appeared when a local corporation employing large numbers of immigrant workers sponsored a kindergarten for their children. In the city of Fall River, where public kindergartens were established in 1892, as late as 1912, Mrs. Spencer Borden was supplying furniture, materials, and all other equipment to the school system's five classes. Even in the wealthy Boston suburb of Brookline, considered by an observer in the 1890's to possess "one of the most unique school systems in the country," where the kindergarten had been part of the school system since 1888 and where in 1896 a kindergarten existed in every public school building, charity overtones were retained. Discussing educational activities in the town, Superintendent of

---

[55] Cambridge, School Report, 1889, pp. 28-30; ibid., 1890, p. 34; ibid., 1900, p. 41; ibid., 1901, p. 50; Cambridge, City Documents, "Mayor's Inaugural Address, 1892," pp. 38-39; Cambridge Chronicle, 9/2/99, p. 9.

Schools Samuel Dutton noted that the Brookline Education Society and Child Study association brought "cultured women" together with "those less favored" to explain the care of children. Dutton, one of the most articulate and active exponents of innovation among the state's professional educators, an advisor to Kindergarten Magazine, and a propagandist for widespread kindergarten education, remained committed, like other educators, to the particular applicability of such classes to "all neglected children and those whose breeding and environment are likely to result in criminal habits."[56]

Among the poor, children of immigrant parents were especially singled out for kindergarten attention. In Lynn, which officially never possessed public kindergartens, special sections were created within primary schools dominated by children of non-English speaking parents. Similarly, of the 75 children in Haverhill's two public kindergartens in 1902, 46 were from homes of foreign born parents. In these areas kindergartens became important as a formal means of introducing the English language to immigrant children, subordinating to minor roles the broader conceptions of emancipatory creativity, peer cooperation, and self discipline that had been emphasized by the kindergarten's early advocates. Indeed, the English language assumed such paramount importance that a study of the Boston public schools in 1916 urged all-day kindergartens for children, ages four to six, living in foreign districts of the city as the only means of preparing them for their first grade work.[57]

---

[56] Kindergarten News, 4: 5/94, 170-71; Mary S. Bullard, "Social Work in North Plymouth, Massachusetts," Kindergarden Review, 12: 5/02, 549-52; Fall River, School Report, 1912, p. 25; Amalie Hoffer, "Brookline Schools - Well-Equipped, Well-Developed, Well-Poised," Kindergarten Magazine, 9: 12/96, 282, 285, 288; Samuel T. Dutton, Social Phases of Education in the School and the Home (New York, 1899), pp. 213-215, 245-46; Dutton, "The Kindergarten Child as Pictured in the Atlantic Monthly," Kindergarten Magazine, 11: 4/99, 527-30.

[57] "Foreign Room at Blossom Street," Lynn Item, 4/20/12; Haverhill School

## IV

Although many of the major Massachusetts cities had established kindergartens as part of their public school systems before World War I, the elan and vitality which had marked the movement's early years suffered a noticeable decline in the decade and a half after 1900. Despite continuing assertions that kindergartens were essential for children of the ghetto, despite affirmations of their importance to all children by Secretaries of the State's Board of Education, despite a resolution by the Massachusetts Teachers' Association in 1895 and proposed legislation in 1909 that all cities and towns with populations over 10,000 have public kindergartens, and despite the activities of individual superintendents of schools, public classes showed only moderate growth.[58] While the number of children enrolled in public kindergartens increased from about 3,000 to 14,000 between 1890 and 1900, annual enrollment climbed to only 18,000 by 1914, with Boston and Worcester, the state's largest cities, accounting for half the latter figure.[59] Whereas Massachusetts in 1898 accounted for 8.8% of all kindergarten-

---

57 (cont.) Report, 1902, pp. 31-32; Boston Finance Commission, Report of a Study of Certain Phases of the Public School System of Boston (Boston, 1916), pp. 70-71. See also, Fall River, School Report, 1895, pp. 19-20.

[58] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1884-85, pp. 90-91; ibid., 1894-95, pp. 189, 191-92; Massachusetts, Documents of the House of Representatives, 1909, #577, #1462, #1538.

[59] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1890-91, pp. 56-57, ibid., 1899-1900, p. 129; ibid., 1913-14, p. 198. While Boston and Worcester contained over half (9451 of 18,118) the public school kindergarten children in Massachusetts in 1912, their proportion of total day public school students was only about 25%. The U.S. Bureau of Education estimated that 1500 children, seven to eight percent of the total enrollment, were registered in non-public school kindergartens--tuition charging, charity, and parochial--in 1912. While the figure is probably too low, compared to the 17-18% of all Massachusetts school children enrolled in non-public day school classes, it does suggest that when children went to kindergarten, they were more likely to do so under public auspices, than at a later period in their school life. U.S. Bureau of Education, "Kindergartens in the United States," Bulletin, 1914, #6, pp. 28-29, 66-67; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1911-12, pp. 57, 61, xlix.

registered children in the United States, its proportion gradually dropped to 5.4% by 1912. Even where public kindergartens were established, they sometimes catered to as few as 6% of the eligible population (ages 4-6), although Boston's 22%, Cambridge's 31%, Springfield's 61%, Holyoke's 23% and Worcester's 28% were outstanding among the larger cities.[60]

This decline in the rate of growth of kindergartens accurately reflected developments in individual cities. Boston, which began with a little over 1,000 children when it took over Mrs. Shaw's classes in 1888, grew to 5,000 within a decade, but to only 7,300 by 1914. Similarly, Cambridge jumped from 200 in 1889 to 800 at the end of the century, and then stagnated between 800 and 950 for the next 15 years. Lowell's public kindergartens contained 300 children in 1893, 1,000 in 1900, but then gradually declined to 650 in 1914. Cities which adopted kindergartens in the late 1890's, such as Fall River and New Bedford, often failed to show any significant enrollment gains, although Worcester's classes did grow from 450 in 1898 to 1,000 in 1905, and 2,000 in 1914.[61]

The most obvious question arising from these statistics is why the lessening of commitment. Many educators continued to affirm the kindergarten's importance

---

[60] U. S. Bureau of Education, "Statistics of Public and Private Kindergartens," Report of the Commissioner, 1903, LI; U. S. Bureau of Education, "Kindergartens in the United States," pp. 28-29, passim. The Bureau reported that in 1912, 13.2% of Massachusetts' children between the ages of four and six were enrolled in kindergartens, placing the Commonwealth behind eight other states and the District of Columbia in the percentage of enrolled to eligible population. Ibid., p. 15.

[61] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1897-98, pp. 195-96; ibid., 1899-1900, pp. 127-29; ibid., 1904-05, pp. 177-78; ibid., 1909-10, pp. 103-104; ibid., 1913-14, p. 198; Cambridge, School Report, 1889, p. 17; Lowell, School Report, 1893, p. 30.

Accurate figures on registration and attendance are highly elusive, but three distinctions should be kept in mind. The total enrollment meant all pupils who at some in implementing proper habits of behavior and as an introduction to early school life, yet the movement's enthusiasm waned and its implementation slowed. In part, this reflected heightened concern with costs. Many cities and towns were already heavily taxed to support elementary and high schools, and were particularly burdened by overcrowded classrooms. Under these conditions, a widespread feeling existed that kindergartens were an unjustifiable luxury. Between 1889 and 1909, while enrollment in the Boston kindergartens climbed, the city paid about $20 a year for each pupil. By 1914, however, expenditures had increased to $27 a pupil. Cambridge found itself in a similar situation when instruction per kindergarten pupil increased from $14.78 (1890), to $19.33 (1898), to $27.15 (1908), and finally to $39.77 (1915) as compared to expenditures per primary school pupil of $12.92, $13.94, $16.11, and $24.46 for the same years. Expenses in Fall River went from $12.37 in 1904-05 to $21.65 per pupil in 1913-14, while Lowell, which cut its kindergarten enrollment between 1904 and 1914 found that its expenditures per pupil continued to increase. Although these rises reflected a general trend in school costs, kindergartens remained more expensive than the lower primary grades. As distinctive institutions, they demanded special treatment, and to varying degrees they got it. In a study of 20 American cities in 1911, the Boston Finance Commission found that five of the seven Massachusetts cities analyzed averaged fewer

---

61 (cont.)

time during the school year had registered for classes. This number included children who had enrolled and then dropped out. Another set of figures, the average number belonging, refers to the average number enrolled at any one time. This could significantly differ from the total enrollment. In Cambridge, for example, between 1890 and 1915, the average number belonging annually amounted to between 60% and 80% of the total enrollment. Finally, the average daily attendance was usually the percentage of the average number belonging who could be expected to attend on any single day. In Cambridge, this varied from 65% to 85% between 1890 and 1915, although it was over 80% in 17 of the 26 years. Cambridge, School Reports, 1890-1915, passim.

pupils per teacher in kindergarten than in the elementary schools, and in some cases the difference was dramatic.[62]

Lessening commitment to the kindergarten, however, represented more than a reaction to high and rising costs. Cities were invariably involved in choosing educational innovations or expanding their educational services; kindergartens could have received more priority than they did. "More fundamental [than costs]," David Snedden, State Commissioner of Education wrote in 1915, was ". . . whether the aims and the field of the kindergarten have been defined to the satisfaction of educators." "It is widely assumed," Snedden continued, "that the chief value of the kindergarten is to compensate for deficiencies of home environment."

> Such assumption implies that an ideal environment for the growth of young children has been described, actual deficiencies of particular environments analyzed, and the compensatory functions of kindergarten based on such analyses. There is doubt as to whether this has been done in such a way as to suggest practicable programs for given conditions. Hence in Massachusetts, cities having conditions of environment least favorable to the normal growth of children [viz., the immigrant-industrial cities] have usually the fewest kindergartens. This is a situation certainly inconsistent with the most widely held justification of the kindergarten.

---

[62] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1899-1900, pp. 126-27; ibid., 1904-05, pp. 177-78; ibid., 1913-14, p. 198; Cambridge, School Report, 1890, p. 17; ibid., 1898, p. 19; ibid., 1908, p. 28; ibid., 1915, p. 49; Boston Finance Commission, Report on the Boston School System (Boston, 1911), p. 167.

Only Springfield's kindergartens contained more kindergarten pupils per teacher than elementary pupils, while Lynn, the seventh city, had no official kindergarten classes. Whereas Boston averaged 43 elementary school pupils per teacher, it had only 26 for the kindergarten. Comparable figures in Lowell were 37 to 19, Cambridge 38 to 25, Worcester 34 to 22, and Fall River 33 to 22. Lawrence dropped its experimental kindergarten in 1898 due to financial pressures. Lawrence, School Report, 1898, pp. 15-16. Kindergarten advocates recognized their difficulties, and attempted to persuade the public that the educational benefits were either worth the costs, or compromised their methods to cut costs. See Eastern Kindergarten Association, Does the Kindergarten Pay? (Boston, 1909) and Vandewalker, The Kindergarten in America, pp. 184-85.

In effect, Snedden condemned the kindergarten advocates for implying they could provide an ideal environment to overcome home and neighborhood conditions, without proving their case to the public. Yet there was more to the criticism, for implicit in the argument was a sense that the essential failure of kindergartners had been their attempt to establish their institution distinct from the primary grades.[63]

Kindergartens, Snedden suggested, could not be all things to all people. If, as most of their supporters claimed, they had "positive educational functions, quite independent of environmental conditions of the child," functions which applied to "other forms of education for children living in a wholesome and normal environment," than the emphasis upon the slum child had been misplaced. "Children of English-speaking parents living in good environments," Snedden wrote, could most afford to delay their school work until the age of six, either by remaining at home or engaging in the play activities of the kindergarten. Children of the slums, however, especially the non-English speaking, needed early exposure to a more rigorous school atmosphere, one which combined certain kindergarten methods with systematic primary school training.[64]

This issue, the conflict between essentially structured and formalized learning versus "play" learning, effectively undercut appeals for the kindergarten as a distinctive institution. Within the kindergarten movement itself, the distinctions which had developed between the needs of all children (viz., the Child) and those peculiar to children of the poor, the differences between early childhood schooling for children from healthy homes and those from the urban slum, were reflected in controversy over kindergarten methods.

---

[63] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 48-49.

[64] Ibid.

As Snedden implied, once educators differentiated among categories of children, methods and goals had to be modified. Those who remained committed to the universal child and Froebel's methods therefore came under constant criticism by kindergarten reformers who demanded programs adapted to such categories as the child's nationality, class, age, approximation to normality, physical handicaps, environmental background, and material and social development.[65]

Concern over costs and confusion among kindergartners as to the true nature of their institution soon led Massachusetts educators to focus on the relationship between primary and kindergarten education, evolving a compromise situation which effectively curtailed the latter's distinctiveness, and helped terminate the philanthropic commitments to social amelioration. The establishment of sub-primary classes, or in less defined form, the absorption of the kindergarten by the lower primary grades had particular appeal to those concerned with the slum child. "When. . . children live in crowded quarters," Commissioner Snedden wrote, "and especially if the language of the home be foreign, or else poor English, a twofold gain results from admission at five to a so-called subprimary class. The school will provide for a few hours each day a better environment than the street, and a moderate amount of systematic training will give to the pupil such command of English and training in school behavior in general as to enable him, after entering the first grade, to keep pace approximately with more favored classmates."[66]

---

[65] International Kindergarten Union, The Kindergarten, pp. 242, 295-301. This is an excellent summary of conflicting tendencies in the kindergarten movement just before World War I. See also, Caroline T. Haven, "Changes in Kindergarten Material," Kindergarten Review, 11: 3/99, 408-13.

[66] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 49-50.

The processes of integrating kindergarten methods and formal primary classes can be seen by looking at two major Massachusetts cities--Lynn and New Bedford. In the former during the 1890's, conceptions of the kindergarten combined affirmations of its unique qualities with assertions that it was a rung on the ladder of school success. Kindergartens, Lynn's Superintendent of Schools wrote, placed children in closer contact with teachers than was possible in primary schools, and had "revolutionized modern processes of primary teaching." As such, the city's school board declared in 1895, they should be an integral feature of the public school system--for all children. Between 1895 and 1910, however, visions of the kindergarten as a separate entity gave way to the notion that kindergarten methods were more effective when incorporated into the primary schools. The process was twofold. First, recognition that distinctive kindergartens could not be established: "While the sentiment of the Board continues to favor a system of public kindergartens, to a moderate extent at least, we have been unable to secure the special appropriation required to put the same into effect. With the very large expenditures of the city and limited income from taxes, we may hardly hope for the kindergarten at present, but it is well to keep this interesting question alive and ready for action." Having postponed separate kindergartens, Lynn then sought to introduce kindergarten methods as part of the first and second grades. Clay and paper cutting, story telling, recess and rest periods were thus added to the normal work drill, reading, writing, music and drawing of these grades. The introduction of such methods, the Superintendent believed, would be a means of implementing the basis of the kindergarten without straining finances and without disrupting the teaching staff.[67] By 1909, the Superintendent considered the experiment of unifying kindergarten and primary classes an unqualified success, though two years earlier, his school board had noted that many of these classes contained more than 50 pupils per teacher and were located in small, dark and poorly ventilated rooms. Still, the Superintendent wrote: "That we have successfully solved the problem of the first year work in schools where the means are not available for establishing regular kindergartens preceding the first year course in school, is the general opinion of those who have visited the schools and examined the work."[68]

Even more striking than the situation in Lynn were developments in the immigrant-industrial city of New Bedford. There, rapid population growth--from 40,000 to 96,000 between 1890 and 1910--and large numbers of foreign born, reflecting the enormous expansion of the city's cotton textile industry, placed great pressures upon the city's school system. In the lower grades, where a majority of the children by 1913 came from homes of non-English speaking parents, conditions were exceedingly bad. It was to these children of New Bedford's immigrant mill population that the first kindergartens in the city were directed.[69]

---

[67] Despite assertions to the contrary and questionnaires like that undertaken in Boston, primary school teachers were often hostile to the special characteristics of the kindergarten. See Parker, "The Kindergartens of Boston," pp. 335-36 and Alan P. Keith, Superintendent, New Bedford Public Schools, quoted in U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1914, pp. 100-101.

[68] Lynn, School Report, 1890, pp. 45-47; ibid., 1895, pp. 46-51; ibid., 1897, p. 11; ibid., 1905, pp. 10-13; ibid., 1907, pp. 22-25; ibid., 1909, p. 15.

[69] In 1913, 57% and 53% of the children in the public first and second grades were from non-English speaking homes. Between 1890 and 1910, the proportion of foreign born in New Bedford went from 34.6% to 44.1% of the total population, except for Lawrence, the highest in the state. New Bedford, School Report, 1913, p. 42.

In 1894, under the auspices of the City Mission, an aid station for the poor, two charity classes were set up in the mill and immigrant north and south ends of the city. Within two years, with the Mission's supporters urging the School Board to adopt their classes, a study of kindergartens in other New England cities and agreement that kindergarten training "for children whose home advantages are not of the best," led the Board to authorize creation of three public classes. As had occurred in other cities, however, the initial request was rejected by the City Council which claimed that an already overcrowded school system could ill afford the additional burden of more children. Moreover, the Council argued, offering kindergartens to only part of the city, i.e., the mill population, represented class legislation, improper for it to engage in. Despite the Council's arguments, and the obvious problem of the kindergarten's expense, the Board and Superintendent continued to press for adoption, urging in addition to the by then common pattern of justifications for kindergarten education, that if the public schools were to compete with the city's parochial schools, they would have to offer "all that is best in educational training, and that includes the Kindergarten."[70]

The following year, 1897, the City Council granted $1800 for a one-term experiment with three kindergarten schools, under conditions, however, which manifested a significant deviation from earlier conceptions. The new classes were not to be distinctive institutions, but "should conform somewhat to the plan or organization which rules in all other grades of the schools if they are to become a permanent part of the school system." As was true of primary school teachers, kindergarten instructors were required to conduct two sessions daily, each containing 50 different pupils, though as a concession to the particular necessities of the kindergarten, two teachers were assigned to every 100 pupils. Teachers' home visits, small classes, and an educational ethic distinct from that of the primary schools received little recognition. New Bedford thus initiated its public kindergarten program with virtually no concern for the social reform measures which had dominated much of the movement.[71]

---

[70] Wheelock, "The Kindergarten in New England," pp. 14-15; New Bedford, "Minutes of the School Committee," 7/1/95, 2/3/96, 5/4/96, ms. in the Office of the School Committee, New Bedford; New Bedford, School Report, 1896, pp. 91-94.

Even with these modifications, New Bedford's educators were unhappy. None of the three kindergartens was meeting its quota of 100 pupils per day, making the program more expensive per pupil than originally intended. "I am a firm believer in kindergartens," Superintendent William Hatch wrote at the end of the first year's experiment, "and have so expressed myself before; but I also firmly believe economical questions must have proper consideration in school administration. The cost of kindergartens under the one-session plan [with afternoons devoted to home visits and mothers' clubs] is too great to warrant their maintainence on that plan. If there is not sufficient appreciation of this class of schools on the part of the parents of the city to support the double plan, as much as I should dislike to see kindergartens abandoned here, I should feel it my duty to advise their discontinuance." Five years later, in 1902, attendance continued considerably below expectations. Out of a possible daily enrollment of 300, only an average of 85 children were arriving. With two teachers in each school, Hatch claimed, kindergarten instructors averaged only 14 pupils contrasted to a primary school teacher's 40 to 50. Reflecting growing community concern over school costs, the Superintendent contended that the kindergartens created more problems than they solved.

---

[71] New Bedford, "Minutes," 5/3/97, 8/16/97; New Bedford, School Report, 1897, pp. 97-99.

> I do not wish to be classed as an opponent of the kindergartens. I believe in the underlying principles of the kindergarten most thoroughly. I believe that it would be an excellent thing if most of the children of our schools could have the advantage of the kindergarten. But when under the most favorable conditions they are not half attended, when also primary pupils are crowded out of the buildings to make room for the kindergarten, and when the increasing cost of the schools is causing dissatisfaction that may at any time affect a more important department, it becomes the duty of the Superintendent to lay the facts as they are before the Committee and the pupils.

Especially frustrating to the School Board was the unwillingness of those who most needed the kindergarten to attend: "The great majority of children who do not attend school between five and seven are unfortunately those of foreign parentage, and, as a rule, of the most ignorant kind. They are the very children who should be in school at the earliest permissible age, as they, as a rule, are the first to leave school to go to work."[72]

The kindergarten controversy finally came to a head between 1904 and 1909, when a compromise which effectively eliminated kindergartens was worked out. In the former year, Superintendent Hatch enlarged his criticism from economic to theoretical grounds, claiming that children should not be in school before age six, and suggesting that earlier attendance had no discernable effect on school performance. With the city in the midst of an economic depression the following year, the School Board narrowly voted in June, 1905, to continue the kindergartens, though it recognized that they were expensive and insufficiently patronized. Nine months later, however, the Board reversed itself and moved to abolish the classes, an action which aroused a storm of protest among prominent individuals in the city. At a special public hearing on the Board's proposed action, a citizens' group headed by the founders of the charity kindergartens of the 1890's declared: "In an industrial city like ours we believe it essential to begin the education of hand and mind of the child at the earliest possible time. We therefore petition your Honorable Board to continue the kindergartens we already have and to establish others where they are needed." At the hearing, kindergarten supporters harped on the theme that New Bedford's industrial community urgently needed the classes. The Reverend Paul R. Frothingham, who had started the city's second charity kindergarten in the immigrant north end, declared: "There are some cities where the kindergarten is not so necessary as in New Bedford, cities where all the people are well-to-do, where there are small families, and the parents are able to provide for their children. But in a great industrial center, with large families and crowded conditions, a kindergarten, I believe, plays a very important and necessary part." Indeed, the issue was so important that Frothingham called for the elimination of Latin and Greek from the high school rather than drop kindergartens.[73]

---

[72] Ibid., pp. 100-01; ibid., 1902, pp. 26, 138-39.

In defense of the Board's position, New Bedford's mayor claimed that the one kindergarten with a regular and large attendance was some distance from the mill district, while the two in the areas considered most necessary for kindergarten education hardly attracted any children. The Board itself contended that the high school was a physical wreck and funds had to be found to build a new one, that the city government had granted only $90,000 of the Board's $201,000 request for teachers' salaries, and that most of the primary schools were overcrowded, many in deteriorating condition. Kindergartens, contended the *New Bedford Standard-Times* in support of the Board, were simply too expensive in the face of the city's financial plight. The $4,000 annual expenditure, the paper claimed, could be better diverted elsewhere.[74]

---

[73] Ibid., 1904, p. 142; New Bedford, "Minutes," 6/15/05, 6/30/05, 2/5/06, 3/5/06, 3/19/06; New Bedford Morning Mercury, 3/20/06, p. 8.

Under intense pressure--the School Board received petitions from boards of directors of the Orphans' Home, Mothers' Club, Woman's Club, and City Mission, all representing prominent New Bedford citizens, as well as petitions from several of the mill corporations--the School Committee engaged in a tactical retreat. In June, 1906, two and a half months after the stormy open hearing, the Board voted eight to seven to retain the public kindergartens, and within six months had added a fourth class in the south end. The 1906 decision, however, did not settle the controversy. Confronting a situation in which more than 50% of the children entering first grade did not understand English or could do so only with difficulty, the School Board moved to establish half-time sub-primary classes for five and six year olds. These classes would continue the game activities of the kindergarten but would also introduce the children to the routine of school life. No child under the age of seven would be allowed to enter school after the first two weeks of classes unless he was qualified to do so, thus forcing all newly arrived non-English speaking children into the sub-primary classes. In effect, New Bedford had found that isolating the immigrant child was an effective way of educating him, but that this could best be done by introducing him to the "routine of school life," rather than by establishing distinctive kindergartens.[75]

---

[74] *Ibid.*; *New Bedford Standard-Times*, 3/19/06, p. 6; *ibid.*, 3/21/06, p. 6. See also *Ibid.*, 3/26/06, p. 6.

[75] New Bedford, "Minutes," 4/2/06, 6/4/06, 11/5/06, 2/3/08; *New Bedford School Report*, 1906, pp. 113-15; *ibid.*, 1908, pp. 74-75; *ibid.*, 1909, pp. 71-72.

By 1912, the supervisor of primary education in the city's schools was convinced that in the compromise kindergarten-first grade, "we have at our disposal no more certain means of shortening the primary course for the non-English speaking child. . . ." Yet, for all the possible benefits of such classes, the supervisor was engaging in a form of "newspeak," for, in fact, the vast majority of children from foreign-speaking homes continued to drop out of primary school upon reaching the limit of compulsory attendance. The new program did not increase the immigrant child's stay in the New Bedford public schools. Rather it revealed that New Bedford was unwilling to support expensive kindergarten education, and it reflected what Superintendent of Schools Allen P. Keith declared in 1914 to be "constant friction between the kindergartners and the first-grade teachers. . ." Because of this, Keith claimed, "the kindergartens were never extended in the system."[76]

New Bedford and Lynn were not exceptional cases. They and six other of Massachusetts' 20 largest cities had either eliminated or never established public school kindergartens before 1914. More important, a number of other cities which had maintained such classes were by the second decade of the twentieth century eliminating the kindergarten as a distinctive institution, moving away from the earlier conception of the kindergarten as a unique environment for children. The sub-primary movement prominent in New Bedford had received strong support from the State's Commissioner of Education. The emancipatory goals of creative play and expression within a structured environment and the humanization of early childhood education had become confused with the need to bring order and discipline to the slum child, and after 1900 his problem increasingly became identified as that of assimilation. For the kindergarten, preparation of the child for the primary grades was becoming its raison d'etre, combining English language instruction with an emphasis on traditional learning and curriculum. What Francis Parker had called, "the most important far reaching educational reform of the nineteenth century," were ceasing to be conceived of as environments in themselves or even as supplements to the child's environment, and instead, were assuming positions as ill-defined classes whose major function was to remove the child from his home environment and lead him into the schools as quickly as possible.[77]

---

[76] Ibid., 1912, pp. 82-83; Keith in U. S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1914, pp. 100-01.

This tendency did not introduce totally novel themes into existing conceptions of early childhood education. Rather it represented a subtle change in emphasis which, in turn, resulted in the radical transformation of the kindergarten as an urban institution. Antagonism to the slum child's background had always existed within the kindergarten movement, and indeed, as we have seen, provided a major impetus to its growth. A "social quarantine" movement had even become prominent at the turn of the century, calling for a "strict quarantine for the innocents [i.e., "children of the street and of wretched homes"], where the kindergarten influence and gentle training. . . may overcome the moral starvation from which they suffer, and develop in them human potentialities for goodness."[78] But such views had always coexisted with and even been dominated by philanthropic and settlement goals that had seen the child as a means to larger social reform. The mothers' meetings, social gatherings, child care talks, home visits, and a host of other activities had effectively enlarged conceptions of child schooling. Now, in the first two decades of the twentieth century, Massachusetts' cities began to eliminate or de-emphasize these as regular features of the kindergarten. Cambridge instituted a one-year experiment in double teaching sessions for each kindergarten teacher in 1911 necessitating "the dropping of much of the visiting to the homes of the children as well as the mothers' meetings." Worcester believed that kindergarten teachers had to be trained for the primary grades as well as for their particular kindergarten roles. Boston's Finance Commission undoubtedly offered the most extreme proposal: all-day kindergartens in foreign districts with all four year olds attending.[79]

---

[77] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 49-50; Francis Parker quoted in Kindergarten Magazine, 1: 4/89, 381; Boston, School Documents, 1914, #11, pp. 39-41.

[78] Kindergarten Magazine, 11: 11/98, 146-50. The front cover of this periodical in 1899-1900 carried as one of its goals support for the social quarantine movement in kindergarten and elementary education.

These public pronouncements, however, only partially reflect the changing conceptions of the kindergarten. As revealing was the absence of discussion about the social responsibilities of early childhood educators. Whereas superintendents of schools had once affirmed the key roles kindergartens would play in slum districts, between 1910 and 1914 such discussion practically ceased.[80] Where children of the poor were mentioned, it was now almost invariably in the context of non-English speaking immigrants who needed aid in being propelled through the school and into the work force, rather than in terms of helping reform the larger society of which they were a part. As they became institutionalized in the urban public school, kindergartners moved from the delicate balance they had earlier proposed between freedom and order, emancipation and discipline, to a clear and overriding commitment to control. Slum children, removed from the guiding restraints of healthy, orderly family life, growing up in the anarchic environment of the street, needed, above all else, discipline, needed to be prepared for the strict environment of the primary grades. By the time of America's entry into World War I, Massachusetts' educators had resolved the tension that had existed in the kindergarten movement between focusing on the child or using the child for the larger setting. They had turned from the child in the slum home to the slum child in school, a far easier and cheaper means of education, and in the process they were ceasing to believe that positive benefits could be derived from the former.

---

[79] Cambridge, School Report, 1911, pp. 20-21, 29; Worcester, School Report, 1911, p. 71; Boston Finance Commission, Report, 1916, pp. 70-71. A number of cities still continued to think in terms of broader social issues, although it is hard to gauge their actual involvement. See Springfield, School Report, 1912, p. 60; Fall River, School Report, 1916, p. 39; Worcester, School Report, 1913, pp. 84-85.

[80] In Lowell, for example, between 1910 and 1916 the superintendent of schools never mentioned kindergartens except to report that one had been added or dropped from the system. A little more than a decade earlier, Lowell's pride in its kindergartens was unbounded. Lowell, School Report, 1899, p. 56.

# CHAPTER III

# MANUAL TRAINING: THE SEARCH FOR AN IDEOLOGY

## I

Few among Massachusetts' social and political leaders expected Benjamin Butler's inaugural to be a mild affair. The bête noire of Massachusetts' politics, Butler had upset every expectation by achieving an overwhelming victory in the gubernatorial race in 1882. Now, in January, 1883, he stood ready to vent his hostility, officially sanctioned by the electorate, against the state's establishment and its institutions. Among the latter, public education stood high. The public schools and their leaders, Butler proclaimed, were a fraud upon the body politic. Unwilling to confront the social issues about them, they failed to reach or even be fully concerned with the mass of children in the state. In their too-ready support of higher as opposed to elementary education, Massachusetts' educators, Butler contended, had abdicated their responsibility to the citizenry. They had failed to adopt educational policies beneficial to the mass of workingmen. Most of Butler's inaugural continued in this vein, castigating many of Massachusetts' other major institutions, and much of what he said was ignored by the state's respectable and influential leaders for whom the new governor represented a momentary aberration of the political process. He had caught the political parties unaware, and if they could not undo the electorate's choice before the year was up, they could at least act to limit its effectiveness.[1]

---

[1] Richard Harmon, "The 'Beast' in Boston: Benjamin F. Butler as Governor of Massachusetts," Journal of American History, 55: 9/68, 266-80; Edward Kirkland, Charles Francis Adams, Jr. (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 165-67. Butler's inaugural may be found in Massachusetts Senate, Documents, 1883, #1.

In what it offered, Butler's inaugural confirmed the expectations of those who opposed him. His critique of public education, however, did not stand alone. Prior to 1880, and more frequently afterward, criticisms of the state's schools as irrelevant to the mass of Massachusetts' citizens and to the social conditions of an urban-industrial society were already becoming prominent. The public schools are doing good work, wrote one memorialist to the state legislature as early as 1872, but they failed to do enough.

> Do they educate the people practically? Do they fit all to become self-reliant and heroic? Do they train all to appreciate and cultivate the beautiful endowment of nature with a view to the fulfillment of their destiny? Do they make it possible for every one to work according to his capacity? No; they do not. Their results are superficial, rather than practical.

With cities growing larger, their social problems more acute, schools, a wide spectrum of Massachusetts' leadership demanded, had to become more realistic and more practical educational institutions. "We should recognize the great social problems of the day," wrote Boston's Edwin Seaver in 1884, "and, as educators, endeavor to ascertain what the school can do toward the solution of these problems." Society had dramatically altered in the last generation, Seaver continued, and if it remained somewhat unclear how the schools should respond, it was obvious that failure to act threatened to isolate them into inconsequence.[2]

This theme of response to the changed nature of New England society, the need to establish more relevant schools, dominated Massachusetts' educational debates during the last quarter of the nineteenth century. All who took an interest in the schools--conservatives and reformers, school officials and laymen--sought responses to social change. "During the last twenty years," Worcester's Superintendent of Schools C. F. Carroll declared at the end of the century, "we have introduced into the public schools the elements of many branches of learning. . . All this change represents an attempt to bring the child into contact with life as he will find it later. It is assumed that the child in the schoolroom is already living, and that the conditions and forces of our civilization are here represented." How effectively and how directly should and could schooling be applied to society became the essential questions. Curriculum, pedagogy, the goals of schooling were redefined as each seemed adaptable to social needs. Reform became the application of what society seemed to require for stability and progress to the schools, and in most cases, accepted the fact of progress while seeking education relevant to stability.[3]

---

[2] Lizzie Batchelder, A Memorial on Industrial Schools, Delivered Before the Committee on Education of the Massachusetts Legislature, February 1872, p. 4; Edwin P. Seaver, "Industrial Education," Journal of Education, 20: 11/13/84, 307-08. See also ibid., 16: 9/21/82, 184 and 9/28/82, 194; Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1873, pp. 393-95; Isaac E. Clarke, Art and Industry (U.S. Senate, Executive Documents), 46th Congress, second session, vol. 7, part I, cxii-cxxxii.

No educational issue received more attention in this quest for relevant schooling than manual training.[4] Variants of "hand learning" in the classroom attracted groups as diverse as pedagogical and social reformers, kindergartners and manufacturers, philanthropists and superintendents of schools. Technical education courses, evening schools, sophisticated industrial shops, simple woodcarving rooms, school kitchens, sewing and drawing classes, and children's play received support as manual education innovations. Children as young as five, adults over fifty, males and females were proposed as ideal participants. Drawing upon the kindergarten, object teaching, and the introduction of science laboratory practices into the classroom, pedagogical reformers urged manual training as a key ingredient of educational progress. Manufacturers, less concerned about pedagogy, demanded that the schools take responsibility for Massachusetts' industrial success by teaching basic industrial skills. Educators, admitting their obligations to the state's economy, called for training in the "principles" which underlay all work. Others, believing that American society's cultural and aesthetic standards needed reinforcement, rejected traditional commitments to the teaching of literature and art and supported the reproduction of objects through drawing and wood carving as a means of disciplining taste.[5]

---

[3] C. F. Carroll in Clarke, Art and Industry, part 3, p. xxxiv.

[4] The terms manual education and manual training were used interchangeably. At their most common level, both referred to a wide variety of curricula changes involving the use of hands in the classroom. More specifically, they usually meant activities such as drawing, woodworking, sewing, cooking, school gardens, and many of the kindergarten activities which stood in contrast to the "book learning" of the traditional curriculum, and whose goals were training in broad disciplinary and moral values. Before 1900, most references to industrial education involved the same activities and similar goals as manual education. By the turn of the century, however, industrial education had begun to focus on specific industrial pursuits, that is, industrial vocational training, rather than the general activities of manual training. Contemporary references to industrial education before 1900 in this and the following chapter will thus be synonymous with the manual education movement under discussion. On the changing definition of industrial education, see Chapter 5 below. See also Ray M. Stombaugh, A Survey of the Movements Culminating in Industrial Arts Education (New York, 1936), pp. 5-10.

Above all, however, manual training seemed to its advocates a way of reconstituting society. While technology had brought material advancement, it also threatened traditional values and institutions. Definitions of work, which had once involved self-direction and completed tasks, had been radically altered by the increasing importance of factory production. In the urban environment, especially among the poor, families had difficulty transmitting the values and skills found in the traditionally stable home, among the immigrants greatly complicated by generational conflicts. The threats were widespread, they affected all involved in urban life and touched by technology's impact. Here lay manual training's strongest justification. By teaching children how to work, transmitting the knowledge and values once procured in the shop and home, it seemed a primary means of reintegrating individuals and institutions, providing a link between the past and present, and thereby securing the future.[6]

---

[5] For a capsule summary of the multiple goals of manual training, see George H. Martin, The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System (New York, 1904), pp. 258-59. See also John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," Massachusetts Board of Education, Forty-First Annual Report [1876-77], pp. 185-92.

As an educational response to the disruptions of an urban-industrial society, manual training received strong support as a necessity for all children. Yet it was also justified for its special applicability to select groups within that society. "It is interesting to see," wrote Joseph Lee, the prominent social philanthropist and member of the Boston School Committee, "how invariably the men who take up the whole subject of what can be done for a given class of people,--whether they be the blind, the deafmutes, deformed children, or youthful criminals; or whether they are the boys of a particular parish or club; or whether they are a whole race, like the negroes or the jews,--are at the present time including industrial training among the things which they find themselves called upon to provide." Those outside the normal and acceptable boundaries of American life, those most needing uplift and integration, were those most in need of manual training. Urban families no longer able to understand the nature of work and thus incapable of teaching the values of work, mill children needing special education for their particular problems, the poor lacking discipline, these were some of the groups toward which manual training was most often directed.[7]

---

[6] Citations to substantiate the above arguments will be found throughout this and the following chapter.

Manual education thus combined a host of complex concerns, emotions, and methodologies. While particular rationales tended to dominate individual proposals, rarely was any innovation in hand learning undertaken without a myriad of justifications. Essentially contradictory attitudes often coexisted in support of particular programs; tensions were rarely made explicit or resolved. While demands for industrial efficiency, for example, helped initiate the industrial art movement of the 1870's, they were joined by pleas for aesthetic uplift and pedagogical reform, goals not necessarily or easily made compatible. Manual educators, moreover, never resolved the tension between the professed goal of hand learning for all children and the peculiar needs of particular groups of children. While all urban families, by the nature of the urban environment, needed exposure to controlled physical activity in the classroom, children of the poor required it more frequently and more systematically. Despite the eclecticism and confusion, however, most manual training proposals had a common theme: in a socially disrupted society whose institutions no longer functioned adequately, the school had a responsibility for social restoration. Not concerned with social change itself--they accepted the altered industrial economy and the permanence of the city--but with the manifestations of change--the loss of institutional harmony and the threat to social values--manual educators achieved widespread support for their ideology of restoration. Ironically, however, it was this ideology which would come under attack after 1900, just as manual education seemed to have reached its highest point.

---

[7] Joseph Lee, Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy (New York, 1902), p. 204.

## II

It was hardly surprising that the innovations of the kindergarten became a major buttress of the manual training movement. The former's emphasis upon play objects and the role of physical activity blended smoothly with the latter's emphasis on bodily manipulation, and both stood in sharp contrast to the immobile and abstract pedagogy of most nineteenth century classrooms. By appealing to the child's interests and his natural powers of observation, the kindergartens helped challenge traditional ideas of learning and fostered uncertainty about a learning situation in which the teacher "poured" knowledge into the minds of her pupils. The kindergarten philosophy, "the cultivation of the child as a living and growing organism," through activity and self-assertion, wrote playground and recreation advocate Joseph Lee, led the child to greater self control, undeniably the goal of all education. The Froebelian occupations--drawing, paper cutting, clay modeling, block building, sewing--emphatically manual activities, systematically developed the child's powers of action. " . . . They train the sense of touch to nice observation and the hand to careful and skilful manipulation for the tangible representation of all ideas of the mind and the expression of all the emotions of the soul," concluded the educational reformer, Louisa Parsons Hopkins of the Boston School Committee, aims as valid for older children and adults as for those under six.[8]

Stress upon the educational values of the kindergarten's manual activities, particularly their influence upon the child's powers of self-discipline, observation, and physical control, quickly became central to the broader movement for manual education. Indeed, little distinction was often made between hand learning for little children and manual training for older groups. "In the discussion of industrial education as part of the common school course," a writer in the Journal of Education observed in 1885, "the kindergarten has properly been assigned a place." Eleven years later, the Secretary of Massachusetts' Board of Education could similarly assert with little fear of dispute that "Manual training is in essence though not in name a characteristic feature of the kindergarten."[9]

---

[8] Joseph Lee, "Kindergarten Principles in Social Work," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1903, p. 532; Massachusetts Board of Education, Report of the Committee to Investigate the Existing Systems of Manual Training and Industrial Education (Boston, 1893), pp. 31-32. (Hereafter cited as Report on Manual Training.)

Undoubtedly the most extensive and influential statement blurring distinctions between the broader manual training movement and the kindergarten was offered in 1893 by a committee appointed by the Massachusetts legislature to investigate "whether any existing system of manual training or industrial education, or any modification thereof, can be adopted with advantage in any of the public schools of this Commonwealth." Headed by Louisa Parsons Hopkins, an active campaigner for manual education and kindergartens in the Boston public schools, and including George E. McNeill, a prominent labor reformer, and Edwin Seaver, Boston's reform-minded Superintendent of Schools, the committee drew heavily upon the pedagogical aims and innovations of the kindergarten. Froebel's goals for an "all-sided education," wrote Seaver, depended upon "reaching every element of the child's being, utilizing every wholesome influence from his surroundings," and demanded that schools provide outlets for the child's creativity as well as his acquisition of knowledge.

---

[9] Thomas Tash, "Kindergarten," Journal of Education, 22: 9/3/85, 156-57; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1895-96, p. 169. An interesting example of the close association between manual education and the kindergarten was the publication in 1869 of Elizabeth Peabody's "A Plea for Froebel's Kindergarten as the First Grade of Primary Education" as an introduction to Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman, The Identification of the Artisan and Artist (Boston, 1869).

> . . . There should always be among the disciplines of school and home systematic exercises in the translation of thought into action, of mental ideas into outward material representations. . . Indeed, it is easy to see that Froebel's principles, carried to the full extent of their application, would bring manual training not only up to the high school but through it and even beyond.

Less symbolically, Mrs. Hopkins added, "Give the child a tool, you at once differentiate him from the animal."[10]

Supporters of manual training thus generalized and converted the kindergarten's commitment to learning through physical activity and the adaptation of schooling to the natural desires of the child into an essential rationale for their movement. "Ought not the true elementary course of study," asked Frank A. Hill, Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education in 1894, "to recognize the entire environment in a simple, child-appealing way? Ought we not to attach greater importance to the currents of likes and dislikes in the child's nature,--in short, to respect child interest more than at present? Ought not the work spirit to be developed gradually out of the play instinct?" The essence of school learning, manual training's advocates contended, lay in keeping the child busier and "making him think he was happier in school than elsewhere," and recognizing "that the benefits that can come from drill and reiteration can also come through the lively interest that is excited by the practical working of problems in drawing and by the actual making of things in mechanical training."[11]

---

[10] Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 3-11, 41, 49, 70, 273.

[11] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1893-94, p. 146, ibid., 1903-04, pp. 85-86; Fall River, Annual Report of the School Committee, 1902, p. 34; American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1880, p. 39, for similar comments by Francis W. Parker. (Hereafter reports of school committees and superintendents of schools will be cited as School Report.)

While the kindergarten became a basic source of support for manual education in the higher grades, it was by no means an exclusive pedagogical rationale. Manual training also drew upon other pedagogical reform movements to support its cause, particularly those related to "object teaching" and laboratory methods of instruction. The movement to bring real objects into the classroom, or at minimum pictures or representations of objects, rather than simply trying to comprehend them through the written word had appeared before the Civil War, but it was only tangentially related to manual training. Calling for the "substitution of a knowledge of the thing, in place of a verbal account of the thing," object teaching's underlying principle was that "things, not signs for things, are the source of knowledge; the true educating forces. Objects, facts, phenomena are observed, compared, classified, related. Analysis and induction are used as a means of training." For pedagogical reformers, object teaching thus represented a commitment to enlivened classroom learning and a reversal of the "pouring-in" process of teaching by allowing children to observe and define the characteristics of objects rather than being told about them. With the emergence of manual training as a major educational movement, object teaching's emphasis on the material and specific rather than the general and abstract, its devaluation of the role of books and the written word in the learning process, increasingly seemed applicable to tendencies in the larger movement.[12]

The attempt to introduce laboratory methods into the schools as the basis of teaching science, like the object teaching movement to which it was related, was originally distinct from manual training. It too, however, quickly became an important rationale for the latter. To individuals like Frank A. Hill, former principle of the Cambridge English High School and during the 1890's Secretary of the State Board of Education, the manual training idea first evolved out of the belief that learning occurred best when students saw how things were done, especially by doing it themselves. In this sense, Hill argued, the early school chemical laboratories were important aspects of manual training. In elementary schools, the laboratory method of learning could mean studying plant life by spending time outdoors in the fields or bringing plants into the classroom. The underlying idea was participation; the goal, to have pupils rather than the teacher do the seeing, thinking, and relating. Participation, experimentation, self discovery through the manipulation of objects, these to Hill were some of the methods of manual training, and he, along with others, claimed that school laboratories and school workshops represented the same processes of pedagogical reform.[13]

---

[12] Clarke, Art and Industry, part I, ix; Martin, Evolution of Massachusetts Public Schools, pp. 241-42; Boston, School Documents, 1881, #5, pp, 8-11. See also M.I.T. President Francis A. Walker's comments on the failure to provide object teaching in the pre-Civil War classroom, quoted in Clarke, part 2, p. 771 and Michael B. Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, 1968), p. 133. On object teaching as a pedagogical goal, see Charles J. Brauner, American Educational Theory (Englewood Cliffs, 1964), pp. 38-48.

The kindergarten, object teaching, and school laboratories, while accentuating the physical nature of learning, all, nevertheless, justified themselves as aids in training the mind. Similarly, manual education had to evolve an elaborate rationale to establish a relationship between hand activities and mental growth. "Drawing is an intellectual exercise," wrote a teacher in the Boston public schools, "the power of which resides in the head, and not in the hand, as some suppose."

---

[13] Frank A. Hill, "The Manual Training Idea--Reminiscences of Personal Growth into its Spirit," Manual Training Magazine, 1: 10/99, 1-8, 12; John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element," p. 188; Edwin Seaver in Clark, Art and Industry, part 2, pp. 795-96.

> The head directs the hands: that it may direct it aright, it must have knowledge; and this calls for study. In learning to draw, there are laws of Nature and Art that must be investigated and understood; and in the representation of forms, however simple, there must be mental effort. Without thought, one can no more describe the form and appearance of an object by means of lines, than he can without thought describe it by the use of words. Considered in the light of an intellectual exercise merely, the mental effort which the study demands must be of advantage to those who receive instructions.

Drawing heightened one's ability to observe closely, cultivated neatness and accuracy, and above all, through the hand, strengthened the intellectual powers of the mind.[14]

Arguments such as this were used to justify a host of other manual activities from sewing and wood carving to complex machine working. Some manual training advocates went even further and posited a physiological basis for intellectual growth. Sensory perception, they claimed, stimulated the mind into acting through the hand, whose muscular responses, in turn, were implanted in the "motor areas" of the brain. This soon led to efficient reflex acts allowing the individual's mind and body to respond in complete harmony.[15] Whatever the form of the argument, however, manual education advocates agreed on the unity of mental and manual activity. ". . . The child's mind," wrote Samuel Capen, in a representative statement, "can be trained through the hands oftimes better than in any other way." Or, more assertively, "Hand culture," concluded Frank Hill, "is really mind culture," simply taking a new direction.[16]

---

[14] Quoted in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report [1869-70], pp. 192-93, 196.

[15] Thomas M. Balliet, "The Psychology of Manual Training," Journal of Education, 38: 12/7/93, 364-65; Balliet, "Manual Training: Its Educational Value," Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1894-95, pp. 481-99; ibid., 1895-96, p. 169; Dr. Birch Hirschfelder, "The Value of Instruction in Manual Dexterity as Regards Bodily Development and Hygiene," in Clarke, Art and Industry, part 2, pp. 896-901.

This integration of the hand and the mind was a pedagogical key to manual training's entry into the classroom. By helping blur distinctions between books and tools, between mental functions and physical activities, it allowed Massachusetts' educators to accept manual education. To a great extent, the integration occurred because the common schools had traditionally used their curriculum for moral and disciplinary rather than intellectual purposes. Books added not so much to the student's store of knowledge, as they systematically disciplined his mental faculties and provided a basis for moral behavior. While the schools had differentiated between a scholar's books and the workman's tools, they did so because the former provided more adequate insight into moral decision making and more effectively trained the powers of observation, accuracy, reasoning, and perseverance. Literature thus became grammar and with mathematics disciplined the mind, only secondarily providing it with knowledge. In the post-bellum era, when manual training's advocates contended that tools shaped the same powers as books, and that these were not intellectual but disciplinary and moral, they drew upon a primary theme of American common school education. "The exercises in manual training," wrote Louisa Parsons Hopkins for the Boston School Committee, "are a means not of physical and intellectual but of moral culture. They train to habits of accuracy, neatness, order and thoroughness; they exercise the judgment, will and conscience; they present an incentive to good work in all directions, and offer a moral stimulus and preparation for usefulness at home and in the community."[17]

---

[16] Samuel Capen in Journal of Education, 38: 9/21/93; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1895-96, pp. 170-71.

By contending that manual activities under classroom control disciplined the individual's powers to act in morally responsible ways as effectively as books, manual education's supporters co-opted a central theme of American education, and laid the pedagogical base for their onslaught on the common school curriculum. In doing so they considerably narrowed the range of maneuverability for manual education's opponents. The latter could deny the moral value of manual activities, but risked condemnation for what could be construed as attacks on the value of work. They could reject any association between the controlled and limited exercises of a manual training classroom and the traditional and beneficial forms of manual labor. On a higher level, opposition sometimes focused on the school's inability to achieve the social results about which manual training seemed most concerned, while a few sought to disassociate the mind from the body, claiming intellectual problems be treated as distinct entities. By the last decades of the nineteenth century, however, such defenses seemed shrill responses to the emerging consensus on the value of hand learning.[18]

## III

Calls for pedagogical reform and the integration of hand and mind learning were fundamental to the acceptance of manual education by Massachusetts' public schoolmen. Commitment to teaching reforms allowed for changes in curriculum and pedagogy without raising the specter of radically altering the traditional goals of public education--common schooling for all children--thus allowing many of the state's educators to accept manual activities in the classroom. But pressures for change centered on more than pedagogy; the demands for manual education frequently called for socially relevant learning only tangentially related to teaching methods. An excellent early example was the movement for drawing which combined arguments for industrial efficiency, cultural uplift, and pedagogical improvement to produce legislation in 1870 requiring that the subject be taught in Massachusetts' larger municipalities. The drawing movement additionally revealed the difficulties of consensus on manual education, the problems involved in uniting disparate conceptions of school and society.

---

[17] Hopkins in Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, p. 49. On moral education as the outcome of a well-rounded common school education, see Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 124-32. Mental discipline in nineteenth century education is treated in Walter B. Kolesnick, Mental Discipline in Modern Education (Madison, 1962), pp. 10-29.

[18] On the opposition to manual education, see below pp. 189-97.

The Civil War had unsettled many of Massachusetts' leading manufacturers. An unstable supply of raw cotton, the curb on European immigration, and thus on unskilled workers, during the war had raised for the first time serious questions about the shape and future of industrial growth in the state.[19] Though not as articulate about their industrial needs in the immediate post war period as they would be a decade later, the manufacturers would have undoubtedly assented to an 1882 report of the Massachusetts Legislative Committee on Education, which argued, with reference to the textile industry, that

> The period in which Massachusetts can control the coarser manufactures is rapidly passing away. Other sections of the country, taking up this kind of products, are destined to outdo us in a short time. Massachusetts, if she would hold her ground and make for herself a sure commercial future, will be obliged to enter upon the manufacture of finer and costlier textiles, for which we have hitherto depended upon the European markets. The com-

---

[19] On the impact of the war on cotton textile production, the state's largest industry, see Victor S. Clark, History of Manufacturing in the United States(Washington, D.C., 1929), II, 26-30, 104-07.

> mercial value of industrial products depends upon the amount of skill employed in producing them. We are in danger of not appreciating this economic principle.[20]

Forced to import raw materials--whether in the textile, shoe, or machine product industries--increasingly committed to manufacturing as the basis of the state's economy--by the end of the 1880's, factories accounted for about 91% of the total annual wealth created in the state--Massachusetts' economic health seemed to depend upon synthesizing business acumen and skilled labor in the production of high quality goods. The question was not a matter of "equal skill, equal brains," declared George Hoar, a prominent spokesman for Massachusetts' industrial interests and a future U. S. Senator, in 1869, "but superior skill and superior brains that she [Massachusetts] must use to enable her to overcome the natural laws of distance and climate." Superior skill within the work force, the manufacturers recognized, meant either importing qualified European workmen or training Americans. Since the former would require at least some retraining to the peculiarities of American industry, was potentially disruptive of the social stability of the native working class, and might lead to costly competition with European employers for their workers, the choice for educating Americans seemed obvious. In addition, by the late 1860's many of Massachusetts' leading manufacturers had become favorably impressed with European claims, especially those of Germany and England, that industrial growth and technical training were intimately related, and that a positive state policy could further both.[21]

---

[20] Quoted in Clarke, Art and Industry, part I, p. 612; Clark, Manufactures, II, 389-90.

[21] George F. Hoar, Claims of the Free Institute of Industrial Science Upon the Commonwealth. Presented Before the Committee on Education of the Legislature of Massachusetts, February 11, 1869; Clark, Manufactures, II, 145-46, 184; Clarke,

With Massachusetts' industry so heavily weighted toward textile and machine production, skilled labor meant at least some acquaintance with the problems of mechanical drawing and industrial design. "Every branch of manufactures in which the citizens of Massachusetts are engaged," declared a petition to the state legislature in 1869 calling for public supported industrial drawing classes, "requires, in the details of the processes connected with it, some knowledge of drawing and other arts or design on the part of the skilled workmen engaged." "It will be impossible," claimed Francis C. Lowell and Edward Everett Hale, initiators of the petition which included such prominent businessmen as Jacob and E. G. Bigelow, James Lawrence, John Amory and Francis C. Lowell, Jordan Marsh and Company, and A. A. Lawrence and Company among its signatories, "for Massachusetts long to maintain any eminence in the higher manufacturers if the great body of workmen of other countries are the superiors to our own in the arts of design, in the drafting of machinery, and in the habits of observation from such accomplishments." As important, the 1869 petition suggested, Massachusetts had failed to take the lead in industrial design because public education was unwilling to take responsibility for the industrial future of the state. "At the

---

21 (cont.)

Art and Industry, part I, pp. cxxxvi-cxxxviii; ibid., part 3, p. 787; Martin, Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System, pp. 250-52.

Concern over competition with Europe, particularly in the comparative training of skilled workers played an important role in the ideology of the drawing movement. See Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Sixth Annual Report [1871-72], pp. 192-93. Isabella MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal: Boston Public Schools, 1888-1891," pp. 36-37, unpublished honors thesis, Radcliffe College, 1967 in Schlesinger Library suggests that the manual training activities of the 1870's were designed to assure the social stability of the native working class by training them as a labor elite.

present time," the petition declared, "no wide provision is made for instruction in drawing in the public schools.[22] Our manufacturers therefore compete under disadvantages with the manufacturers of Europe; for in all the manufacturing countries of Europe free provision is made for instructing workmen of all classes in drawing. At this time almost all the best draughtsmen in our shops are men thus trained abroad."[23]

The manufacturers' stress on industrial progress was reinforced by the less significant but nonetheless frequently invoked theme of economic mobility for the working man. Mechanical drawing,[24] reported the superintendent of the Merrimack Manufacturing Company in Lowell, one of the largest textile manufacturers in the state, "takes the place of a knowledge of reading and writing in the other concerns of life, and is indispensable for giving and receiving intelligible ideas." Supporting the petitioners' call for drawing classes in the cities and towns of the state, he asserted that without such knowledge, a mechanic "will almost always be subservient and inferior to one who has it." The subject, declared the Secretary of the State Board of Education, would differentiate the highly skilled from the "uneducated or but partially educated."[25]

---

[22] Drawing was a loosely used term following the Civil War, but in this context it referred to art work based on geometric principles rather than pictorial representation. Thus elementary drawing in day schools as well as advanced mechanical drawing for skilled workers drew upon the same ideal: systematic instruction in geometrically defined exercises which could ultimately be applied to industrial uses. See Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, p. ci.

[23] The petition and the subsequent responses to it by the Legislature and Board of Education can be found in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report [1869-70], pp. 163-65. Lowell, one of the first cotton textile manufacturers in the state, and Hale are quoted in ibid., p. 153, but see other support for drawing, pp. 151-56. Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. 37-194 contains a full account of the drawing movement in Massachusetts between 1870 and 1882, although the analysis differs from the one offered here. See also, Donald Bohn, "'Artustry' or the Immaculate Misconception of the 70's," History of Education Quarterly, 8: Spring, 1968, 107-10.

[24] The Board of Education defined mechanical drawing as "all those branches of drawing which are applicable to the productive or industrial arts." Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, p. 164.

Economic success for state and individual, however, were not the only justifications offered in support of drawing in the schools. Indeed, where educators were willing to recommend the subject, they tended not to stress economics, but rather pedagogical reform for more traditional goals: drawing, as an example of object learning, enhanced and systematized the pupil's powers of observation and his ability to act with accuracy.[26] In addition, in the person of Charles C. Perkins, one of Boston's most distinguished Brahmins and a member of the Boston School Committee, classroom drawing seemed less an industrial and more a cultural issue.

Although Perkins acknowledged the manufacturers' arguments that "A skilled artisan is a mechanic who knows how to draw, and who, thanks to such knowledge has quadrupled the value of his labor to himself and to the state," he urged drawing for its ability to raise the cultural standards of society by uniting art and artisan. Industrialization, Perkins argued, had sundered the former ties between producer and artist, leaving in its wake aesthetically inferior products and destroying society's aesthetic tastes. An active promotor of Boston's Museum of Fine Arts and authority on art, he found the preservation of art objects in museums and the drawing of objects in the classroom parallel quests to restore society's awareness of form, shape, contrast, and beauty, thereby allowing cultural standards to survive.[27]

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 152-53; ibid., Thirty-Sixth Annual Report, p. 192. That education would increase an individual's earning capacity had become a widely accepted tenet by the post bellum period. See Edward Jarvis, "The Value of Common School Education to Common Labor," Bureau of Education, Circulars of Information, 1879, #3.

[26] See, e.g., Boston Superintendent of Schools John D. Philbrick's comments in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Ninth Annual Report [1874-75], "Abstracts of School Committees' Reports," pp. 167-68.

Perkins' pleas for schooling in aesthetics, a few educators' willingness to accept drawing as a pedagogical reform, and especially, the businessmen's demands for industrial education combined to produce legislation in 1870 requiring that drawing be taught in the public schools of cities and towns having more than 10,000 inhabitants, and that free industrial drawing classes be offered to all persons in those municipalities over 15 years of age.[28] The coalition which forced through the statute, however, had failed to recognize its divergent aims. Perkins seemed as committed to reconstructing traditional handicrafts--an anti-industrial bias--as with mass cultural uplift, while the manufacturers sought industrial progress and only adopted drawing instruction as a means to that end. Moreover, the state's educators were rarely consulted in the initiation of the drawing movement, and of the two who voiced the most support, one, Joseph White, Secretary of the Board of Education, was a former cotton mill agent who reflected the views of his former employers, while the second, Superintendent of Boston's public schools, John D. Philbrick, was closely affiliated with Perkins. Eclectic in its goals, supported by individuals whose conception of social progress was at best at variance, and having uncertain support among the state's educators, drawing underwent a period of considerable conflict, its development during the 1870's revealing a great deal about the early phases of the manual training movement.[29]

---

[27] Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. ccxxviii, 343-46; ibid., part 2, pp. xxxviii-xli; "Charles Callahan Perkins," Dictionary of American Biography, XIV, 464-65; Charles C. Perkins, "Art Education in America," Journal of Social Science, 1871, pp. 37-57 and "Art Schools," ibid., pp. 95-104. Neil Harris perceptively points out that people like Perkins were more concerned with upgrading the values of popular culture than with preserving any particular cultural standards. They thus saw the Museum of Fine Arts primarily as a pedagogic institution. "The Gilded Age Revisited: Boston and the Museum Movement," American Quarterly, 14: Winter, 1962, 545-66. See also Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 48-49; Rev. Charles G. Ames, "Boston--The City of God," New England Magazine, 10: 8/94, 770. For an interpretation of the whole industrial art movement as an attempt to reintegrate fine arts and industry, see Charles A. Bennett, History of Manual and Industrial Education to 1870 (Peoria, 1926), pp. 374-442.

[28] The legislation and the steps leading to it are in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, pp. 143-59, 163-66.

Within a few months of the drawing act's passage, Board of Education Secretary White recorded his "great satisfaction to learn that the law has been cordially welcomed in nearly every section of the State. It evidentally met a felt if not an acknowledged want." Worcester, Springfield, Cambridge, Charlestown, Salem, Taunton, New Bedford, Fall River, and Boston of the 23 cities included in the mandatory provisions of the Act had established industrial art classes in the evenings and had moved to institute drawing instruction in the day schools. Implementation, however, was neither as extensive nor school committees as responsive as the Act's originators had hoped. Unable to coerce local school systems, Secretary White pleaded with manufacturing municipalities to abide by the law. To overcome hesitancy on the part of school authorities--financial and educational--the legislature authorized the printing of 2,000 copies of a pamphlet supporting drawing education, while White recommended using a special drawing teacher to instruct the regular teaching staff, an economically more feasible alternative to hiring a number of drawing specialists. To stimulate further interest in the subject, the Board of Education also agreed to cooperate with Boston in sharing that city's newly appointed Supervisor of Drawing, Walter Smith.[30]

The appearance of Smith and his subsequent stay in Massachusetts were probably as revealing of the fate of the drawing movement as any series of events of the 1870's. Director of learning at a technical school in Leeds, England, Smith's association with the movement to provide technical instruction for industrial growth in his country seemed to make him an ideal choice for the Massachusetts manufacturers. Simultaneously, as a former student at the South Kensington Museum of Art, he had been a participant in the attempts to integrate art and artisanship. This latter condition laid the basis for his recruitment in 1870 by the Boston School Committee, or more particularly, by Charles C. Perkins and Superintendent John D. Philbrick, to systematize and expand drawing instruction in the city's schools. After an initial period of dickering, during which Smith first rejected Boston's offer as financially insufficient, the Englishman consented to a joint appointment as Supervisor of Drawing in Boston and Director of Art Education in the state, the latter arranged by Philbrick in his capacity as a member of the Massachusetts Board of Education. Smith also appears to have been assured that his city appointment, at least, was permanent, and he thus could avoid educational and political controversy.[31]

---

[29] Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, p. 207; Clarke, Art and Industry, part 2, pp. xxxv-xxxviii.

[30] Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, pp. 146-59.

The new appointee threw himself into his work with almost total abandon. He arranged exhibits of instructional models and examples of proper drawing techniques, and traveled with them to the state's major cities. He regularly conferred with school committees, addressed teachers on the problems and requirements of school drawing, spoke at public forums, examined evening and day classes, and constructed an elaborate drawing curriculum from grade one through high school. In 1873, he became director of the newly opened State Normal School founded "to provide teachers of industrial art as a means of remedying, even if indirectly, the deplorable want of skill and taste in the industries of the State."[32]

---

[31] Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. 155, 202-19, 234-236, 282-83; Bennett, Manual . . . Education to 1870, pp. 421-31. Clarke believed that Perkins, Philbrick, and Smith did more than any other individuals to initiate industrial art education in the United States. Clarke, part 1, pp. ix, 3-4, 348.

All of this activity, however, seemed to do less for the expansion of drawing than to stir up heated antagonisms. In Boston, the Supervisor's administration was a constant source of controversy. Smith, the School Committee, and teachers clashed over requiring the latter's attendance at Smith's lectures on drawing methods. During the late 1870's, his attempts to eliminate all special drawing instructors, replacing their lessons with ones taught by regular classroom teachers, antagonized the former without befriending the latter, who seemed generally hostile to the formalized drawing system. Combining an abrasive personality with a tendency to overstate European contributions to the industrial art movement and an emphasis upon English instructional models, he forced Superintendent Philbrick at least twice publically to justify sending to England for a drawing instructor. "Now I hold that whilst it requires some courage to say deliberately," Smith told one Massachusetts audience in words not likely to endear him to his listeners, "that we are behind European nations in taste and skill, we must say it, though it makes the eagle scream, or the lion roar, for it is the only verdict that can be given by honest and competent judges."[33]

But if personality acerbated the controversies over Smith, conflict also emerged as to drawing's methods and goals. The two individuals most responsible for Smith's appointment, Charles Perkins and John Philbrick, remained committed to drawing for its cultural rather than industrial value. Smith, seeking to harmonize the two positions, emphasized the future industrial value of the evening classes and the pedagogical and cultural goals of drawing in the day schools. Finding, however, evening students ill-prepared for advanced technical drawing, which involved at least some mathematics and acquaintance with mechanical drawing technique, he argued that elementary drawing, the simple illustration of geometric figures, had to be studied. While his course of study for elementary and high schools was hardly "ornamental," a common epithet launched at drawing, it did include pedagogical goals whose relationship to industrial development could only with great difficulty be perceived. Finally, rather than convert the State Normal Art School into an industrial drawing training center, he offered broad art instruction to his students.[34]

---

[32] Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fifth Annual Report, [1870-71], pp. 109-11, 134-50; ibid., Thirty-Sixth Annual Report, pp. 22-24, 47-53; ibid., Thirty-Seventh Annual Report, pp. 63-68; ibid., Forty-First Annual Report, p. 40.

[33] Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. xcv, 174, 231-32, 236, 252, 265; Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Eighth Annual Report [1873-74], pp. 48-49.

These decisions satisfied no one, a fact which said as much about the confused and conflicting goals of the drawing movement as anything else. The manufacturers who had pushed through the 1870 drawing act remained committed to industrial progress, and indeed, their view seemed ascendant in the first years after its passage. While controversy existed over drawing's aesthetic value, reported the Board of Education in 1872, widespread agreement had been reached as to the "commercial value of instruction in the various departments of *industrial art*, especially in a community largely engaged in mechanical and manufacturing pursuits." That same year, the legislature authorized any town or city to establish independent industrial classes to teach trades or occupations, an act made necessary, Secretary of the Board Joseph White declared, because the common day schools did not appear capable of providing such instruction. Where industrial art classes were opened, most cities focused on industrial and mechanical instruction for adults, the majority of whom were already skilled workers, with working draughtsmen acting as teachers. In Lynn, for example, during the 1870-71 school year, the evening industrial drawing schools contained 25 carpenters, 6 masons, 5 printers, and 7 machinists among their 78 students, with the remainder scattered among clerks, bookkeepers, and other skilled artisans or low level white collar workers. Boston and Adams evening classes revealed similar compositions.[35]

---

[34] *Ibid.*, *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report*, p. 7; *ibid.*, *Thirty-Seventh Annual Report*, pp. 58-59; *ibid.*, *Thirty-Eighth Annual Report*, p. 43; Clarke, *Art and Industry*, part 1, pp. 99-105, 110, 114-115, 120-21, 125-26, 172-75, 190-93, 605-21.

Most towns thus viewed the purposes of their evening classes in vocational terms. "The free evening drawing schools," wrote a committee of the Boston School Committee, "were established for mechanics and artisans wishing to make up deficiencies in their education, which, as they feel, seriously interfere with their success in life. Skilled labor commands high wages, and skilled labor is what these schools should produce." Even in the day schools, where attention was ostensibly paid to drawing as an aesthetic and refining art, as in Boston, its essential justification revolved around "how important the study of drawing is to the advance of the best interests of a great manufacturing state like Massachusetts. Many of her children in the Public Schools must hereafter win their daily bread by trades and professions which demand an elementary knowledge of the arts of design. . . ."[36]

---

[35] Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Sixth Annual Report, pp. 7-9, 181-83; ibid., "Abstracts of School Committees' Reports," p. 86; ibid., Thirty-Ninth Annual Report [1874-75], "Abstracts," p. 6; Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, p. 224.

[36] Committee on Music and Drawing of Boston School Committee in Clark, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. 257-58; Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirth-Ninth Annual Report, "Abstracts," p. 158.

To those arguing for an industrially-oriented education, Walter Smith's attempts to harmonize art and industry seemed a waste of time and effort, and the drawing supervisor's defenders were forced to justify his system in terms of its industrial value. By the mid 1870's, the committee on drawing of Boston's School Board, chaired by Charles Perkins, revealed the horns of the dilemma,

> Drawing has not, by a considerable class of people, been recognized as an industrial study, it being common to hear the phrase 'ornamental branch' applied to it by members of the school committee and masters, as well as by that portion of the general public who have vague notions that it still retains its ancient significance of the expenditure of valuable time over impossible landscapes and unnatural prancing horses, whose delineation had but an exceeding remote relation to the earnings of an honest livelihood. . . In truth, the systematic instruction in drawing. . . may be considered one of the most intelligent and important additions to the practical education of the working classes, whose children constitute so large a majority of our public pupils, which has been attempted in the history of education.

Four years later, the committee again had to defend the subject:

> With drawing. . . there is no peace. Some persons, overlooking its industrial bearing, object to it as a study. They regard it as an accomplishment connected with the fine arts, and therefore unfit to be taught in public schools. Others make war upon drawing on account of the expense of teaching it, for which they can see no adequate return. Still, a third party exists, who denounce the system by which it is taught, as mechanical, unartistic, and worse than useless.[37]

The committee's defense of Smith, its rationale for combining art and industry theoretically to the latter's benefit was to little avail. By the end of the 1870's, the Boston School Committee was proposing more explicitly industrial education using tools rather than pencils, and recommending that $15,000 be appropriated for a special school to train young mechanics. In 1878, Superintendent Philbrick, who had supported drawing but opposed more extensive manual training programs, was dismissed. A few years later,

---

[37] The defense of Smith can be found in Clarke, Art and Industry, part 1, pp. 240-41, 259-60.

Smith was fired from his positions as director of the Normal Art School and Supervisor of Drawing in Boston. Interest in the evening drawing classes waned throughout the state, and supporters of schooling for industrial growth turned to more systematic technical instruction, mechanic arts high schools, textile schools, and ultimately, public trade schools. In Massachusetts' elementary schools, drawing as a distinctive industrial tool had never received extensive support. Most teachers who taught the subject apparently emphasized accurate reproduction of pictures and objects rather than geometric and mechanical goals.[38]

The drawing movement of the 1870's, then, formally introduced manual training to Massachusetts' public schools. Based, to some extent, upon ante-bellum traditions of practical education, it, more explicitly than any previous movement, demanded that the schools reform their instructional methods, respond to the economic needs of society, and provide for the educational requirements of the working class.[39] These demands would reappear, as would drawing's confusion of industrial efficiency, artisanship, and pedagogy, in almost every other manual training proposal of the next two decades. That part of drawing's rationale which stressed its relationship to technical education provided support for more advanced industrial training such as the School of Mechanic Arts established by John Runkle as a department of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Worcester County Mechanics Free Institute, as well as for the later high schools of mechanic and industrial arts.[40] Reports that industrial drawing students received better jobs, though not often substantiated, seemed also to justify the social mobility arguments of drawing's advocates.[41] These, too, would be drawn upon by other manual training experiments. Equally striking about the drawing movement, however, was how quickly it receded into the background. Manufacturers, soon turned to other activities when it became clear that Massachusetts' economic growth did not depend upon mechanical drawing. As a pedagogical improvement it continued to receive support, but its relationship to aesthetics seemed minimal when an hour or two a week was spent in copying objects. With the appointment of a new Secretary of the Board of Education in 1876, drawing went from one of the most talked about subjects in the Board's Annual Reports to one of the least. After Smith's ouster in 1881, Boston's new supervisor of drawing had only a minimal role in the school system. Without strong financial support and with a lessening of interest, the evening industrial drawing classes, the initial focus of the state's industrialists, never sustained their early growth, and after 1875 stagnated in most Massachusetts cities.

---

[38] Ibid., pp. 172-75, 190-93, 253-59, 261-86, 605-21; ibid., part 2, pp. xlii-xlviii; L. H. Marvel, Manual Education in the Public Schools (Boston, 1882), pp. 11-14; Joshua Bates, Our Common Schools (Boston, 1879), pp. 5-6. On the clash between reform-minded laymen and professional educators like Philbrick, and the latter's removal from office, see Michael Katz, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy in Urban Education: The Boston Case, 1850-1885," History of Education Quarterly, 8: Summer, 1968, 175-85.

[39] On ante-bellum drawing and manual training for the working class, see Bennett, Manual. . . Education to 1870, pp. 317-29; Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 179-80.

Still, drawing's heritage was more confused than its decline as a subject of concern suggests. Justified by its earliest supporters for its vocational possibilities, it was attacked for being insufficiently vocational. Defended as a pedagogical reform, it lacked inspiration and imagination, and seemed in practice hardly to differ from other school subjects. Designed to inculcate cultural values, few seriously believed in its success, although many remained committed to its goal. Finally, drawing revealed the hesitancy among Massachusetts' educators to commit themselves to an ideology which asked that the school's curriculum be determined by particular social needs. Most schoolmen rejected the notion that school subjects should be adopted for particular students, in this case potential industrial workers, as antithetical to a tradition of common schooling which demanded that the curriculum service all children equally. That rejection was infrequently explicit, but it helped account for drawing's final justification as a pedagogic device, a slightly different means to a commonly accepted end.

---

[40] On the School of Mechanic Arts and the Worcester Institute, see Bennett, A History of Manual and Industrial Education, 1870-1917 (Peoria, 1937), pp. 311-13, 322-23; Stombaugh, Industrial Arts, pp. 24-30; Hoar, Claims of the Free Institute of Industrial Science; Berenice Fisher, Industrial Education (Madison, 1967), p. 68.

[41] See, e.g., New Bedford, School Report, 1880, p. 38.

## IV

Support for manual training as a pedagogic reform and the evolution of drawing into a broadly disciplinary classroom activity rather than an industrial skills program revealed the significance of commonality at the core of the common school ideology. Reform had to be based upon its applicability to all groups; innovations in learning had meaning only with reference to the general needs of school children. In the late 1860's and early 1870's, however, a few Massachusetts educators went beyond even the "preparation of industrial workers" argument of the state's industrialists, urging separate compulsory educational institutions for a particular segment of the urban working class: children of the mills.

Even before the Civil War, the education of youthful factory workers had received considerable attention. During the 1820's and 1830's, the broad cultural and social environment created for the mill girls of Lowell and Waltham and the attempts to create a model factory town in Lawrence had seemed the ideal synthesis of democratic capitalism, providing a unique setting for cultural and moral uplift. Stressing the productivity of an educated labor force and the purity of Massachusetts' industry in contrast to European conditions, employers sought to integrate education and industry. Lowell in the 1830's later reported one of its leading participants, "was looked upon much in the light of a school for mental and moral development." Believing that factory work was a temporary phenomenon for rural youth, a means of accumulating some earnings in one's passage from farm to marriage or social and economic mobility, the manufacturers hoped to establish an environment only slightly removed from but more enlightened than the background of their workers.[42]

Yet the ideal was soon shattered. Immigration from Ireland and Canada repelled native youth from the mills, and in conjunction with technological changes in the textile industry, helped create an industrial proletariat whose most pronounced feature appeared to be its permanence. In addition, child labor laws and compulsory attendance statutes thrust the State into the traditional relationship between employer and employee, and demanded more formal institutions of education than those provided the Lowell mill girls. Legislation in 1866 prevented youth under 10 from working in the mills or any other industrial establishment, but more important from the standpoint of public education, a statute of 1867 demanded that no child between the ages of 10 and 15 be so employed without having attended school for 13 consecutive weeks prior to employment, and the requirement was reapplicable annually.[43]

---

[42] Lucy Larcom, "American Factory Life--Past, Present and Future, Journal of Social Science, 16: 12/82, 142; Caroline F. Ware, The Early New England Cotton Manufacture (Boston, 1931), pp. 199-203, 213-22; Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 93-95.

[43] Ibid., pp. 7-8, 96-101; Ware, Cotton Manufacture, pp. 228-35.

Compulsory attendance in mill areas never worked as effectively as its proponents hoped, however. During the mid 1870's, Carroll Wright, director of the state's Bureau of Labor Statistics, even contended that the legislation was a sham, a disgrace to Massachusetts' commitment to universal schooling. Reporting that more than 25% of the children ages 5 to 15 constantly failed to attend school, with the overwhelming number of these at work in manufacturing establishments, he chastized the citizenry "for accepting for years what, out of respect for words, we will call a compulsory school law, [when] we have had but very little of compulsory school attendance." But if public officials, mill agents, and parents--the latter, Wright reported, because they needed the income of their children to survive--tended to ignore the requirements of compulsory schooling, the legislation itself forced upon public school authorities at least some formal recognition of the education of mill children, and complicated the normal workings of the schools. "The law relating to children in manufacturing establishments," reported the Andover School Committee, "does honor to Massachusetts. In it we see the State assuming the relation of parent to the poor and helpless child."

> But like all other good laws, it sometimes seems to clash with the interests of our schools. . . . [These children] have sought admission to our schools at all stages of the term, and have come two or three at a time. Without any habits of study, unused to school order and discipline, coming by compulsion and not by choice, with no prospect of remaining longer than the law requires, and joining classes for which they had no real fitness, disqualified them for membership. The admission of such persons into our graded schools has embarassed them.[44]

---

[44] Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1873, pp. 381, 388-89, 392-95; ibid., 1875, pp. 40, 47-48; 442-43; Andover School Committee in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Third Annual Report, "Abstracts," p. 58. For statements similar to Andover's, see ibid., Thirty-Ninth Annual Report, "Abstracts," p. 30 and New Bedford, School Report, 1885, pp. 21-22.

Fearful of the integration of mill children into the regular public schools, concerned with the disruption caused by the three month attendance requirement, and worried about the educational fate of youthful factory labor, some school committees in the late 1860's opted for separate school facilities. In 1868-69, Salem and Springfield established half time schools, patterned somewhat after the English system of educating working class children, which combined school attendance and labor for factory youth between the ages of 10 and 15. "The Half Time School," reported Springfield's School Committee, ". . . if it is found to succeed. . . is likely to work an important change in our manufacturing communities. Our laws forbid manufacturers to employ children between certain ages, who have not attended school one term at least during the year. By the present arrangement, such children attend school three hours each day through the entire year, and work the rest of the time in the mills." The mill agents in both cities agreed to incorporate those attending school into their work force at two-thirds to three-fourths of their regular pay, establishing what was looked upon as a highly promising cooperative arrangement.[45]

Similar to the Springfield and Salem experiments were the special classes for mill children established in three of Massachusetts' major industrial cities--Fall River, New Bedford, and Lowell. Less heavily dependent upon the explicit cooperation of the mills than the half time schools, these classes required full attendance for three consecutive months rather than shared work and schooling. Theoretically, this caused minimal disruption in individual mills since a quarter of the child labor force could attend classes on a rotating three month basis, and provided for more intensive and therefore more effective schooling of the children. "Here," Fall River's School Committee wrote,

---

[45] Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Third Annual Report, "Abstracts," pp. 113, 116-17; Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1873, pp. 395-96; ibid., 1875, pp. 28-31, 370-71, 395-96. On English half-time schools, see ibid., pp. 7-24 and Bennett, Manual. . . Education to 1870, pp. 293-96.

"the factory operatives are furnished with the facilities for making accessions to their scanty acquirements. The rudiments of the common branches are taught by competent teachers, and there is every reason to believe that many children have obtained, and others are obtaining therein, a knowledge of reading, spelling, writing and arithmetic, which will be of great service to them in future life." Many who came, wrote the Superintendent, looked upon their classes as a vacation from the long hard hours of the mill. "There is no class of young persons within the city limits which should be better cared for in all that will aid them in acquiring knowledge, than those whose circumstances compel them to spend their tender years in manufacturing establishments. If there is a class of children among us that should be provided with commodious school-rooms, well lighted, well heated, well ventilated, and well furnished, these are the children."[46]

Although the mill classes and half time schools sought to provide a modicum of elementary schooling for the children of working class parents, or more accurately of immigrant factory laborers, they never achieved more than a tenuous hold on the public school system, and save for one case, New Bedford, and to a limited extent in Lowell, had disappeared by the end of the 1870's. The flurry of interest which they generated and their rapid disappearance, nevertheless, suggested much about the thrust of educational change for the future and simultaneously revealed that the traditions of common education for all children, the heart of the common school movement before the Civil War, remained too strong for explicitly class segregated schools during the 1870's.

---

[46] Fall River School Committee and Superintendent in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Third Annual Report, "Abstracts," pp. 34-35, 37-39; ibid., Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, "Abstracts," pp. 46-48; and ibid., Thirty-Seventh Annual Report, "Abstracts," pp. 23-24. See also Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1875, pp. 31-37; New Bedford, School Report, 1883, pp. 22-23; ibid., 1884, pp. 57-63. Lowell established a separate school for mill children in 1878. Lowell, School Report, 1878, p. 49; ibid., 1880, pp. 47-48. Lawrence's Superintendent of Schools recommended a separate school, but nothing appears to have come of it. Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Third Annual Report, "Abstracts," p. 64.

In part, of course, one of the major detriments to the success of mill and half time classes was their dependence upon mill agents. In the case of the half time schools, mills had to agree to a daily disruption of their unskilled work force, proportional wage payments, and a willingness not to hire children who did not attend the school. "The fear is," wrote the Springfield School Committee a few months after establishing its half time school, "that our manufacturers may not appreciate such an influence upon their operatives, and upon the character of their villagers, and so not feel that they can afford to pay such wages for so few hours of work." The Committee's fear was well founded. The economic depression which devastated Springfield after 1873 led to demands by mill agents and parents for a full day's work and a full day's pay for mill children, closing the half time school in that year. In New Bedford, where mill children went to school full time for three months, the depression worked in precisely the opposite way. Just prior to 1873, the School Committee chastized the mills for hiring children under 10 and for failing to require compulsory attendance certification for their 10 to 15 year old workers. A year later, the Committee noted that the partial suspension of work in the city's major textile mill had doubled attendance at the mill classes.[47]

Relationships with the mills depended on more than economics. New Bedford's mill schools survived because the School Committee rarely demanded strict adherence to compulsory school attendance from mill agents--the 1873 chastizement was an exception.

---

[47] Ibid., "Abstracts," pp. 113-14; Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1875, p. 37; New Bedford, School Report, 1873, pp. 14-15; ibid., 1874, pp. 18-19. Also ibid., 1872, pp. 63-64; Sylvia Chace Lintner, "A Social History of Fall River," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Radcliffe College, 1945, pp. 258-63, 266.

When legislation in 1876 extended compulsory schooling from 13 to 20 weeks annually for children under 14 before industrial employment, the School Committee responded by declaring, "It is a grave question, in the light of expediency, to what extent this law shall be enforced, so far as the School Committee have the power to enforce it. The change from existing provisions would involve so great an alteration in the basis of employment of children in the mills, that the agents might reluct to institute it, and the cooperation between them and the committee, to which the systematic education of mill children is now largely owing, be broken up."[48]

Fragile relationships between the mills and the public school systems, however, only partially explain the limited existence of the half time and mill schools. Endemic to the schooling of the children of immigrant factory workers in the 1870's was the problem of survival. The wages of Massachusetts' workingmen, reported Carroll Wright in 1875, were hardly sufficient for their families, forcing dependence upon children for one-quarter to one-third of a family's income. Parents thus sought to evade the requirements of compulsory schooling. "Why are they not there," asked the Mill School Committee in New Bedford, "and how do they evade the law with so many efficient officers and law-abiding agents to enforce it?" Daily attendance at New Bedford's mill classes appears to have hovered between 30 and 60 through the 1870's and somewhat higher in the 1880's, while in Fall River in 1875, just prior to the termination of the mill school's existence, average attendance equalled 185 out of an enrollment of 1051, and undoubtedly many more children managed to avoid registering. Although truancy was not limited to the mill schools--school officials in all parts of the state complained about absenteeism--mill classes highlighted its problems by focusing on the group of students least likely to attend school, thereby explicitly raising questions about the desirability of separate facilities.[49]

---

[48] New Bedford, School Report, 1876, pp. 23-24; ibid., 1875, pp. 18-19.

It was this latter issue--segregated public education for certain members of the community--more than the general problem of truancy--the unwillingness of the mills to cooperate in enforcing child labor and compulsory attendance statutes and the economic needs of factory families--which undermined the mill schools. For a social reformer like Carroll Wright, segregated schools were antithetical to the goals of common education, a denial of the ideal of equal opportunity for all children. However, sophisticated conceptions of the common schools played a lesser role in eliminating the mill classes than the latter's reputation as places for defective and delinquent children. "The Committee desired to abolish Factory Schools," wrote Fall River's School Committee in 1877,

> because the reasons for their establishment were sometimes misconstrued, and a consequent prejudice excited against them by parents who were expected to send their children to them. It was feared their tendency was to impart the feeling, that the children who work in our mills are expected to obtain only the minimum amount of instruction, and that to be acquired in separate schools; and that by this process of isolation and restricted opportunities,--deprived of the usual methods of mingling with the mass of the pupils of the city on equal terms and under similar educational conditions,--they would eventually regard themselves as a separate class in the community, occupying a relatively low position in society, and not equally responsible with its more favored members for its good order and prosperity.

Such conceptions on the part of the public were not entirely misguided. The mill classes did, in fact, have very limited goals. As Fall River's Superintendent noted in 1870, they were designed to reach a class of children who could be reached in no other way, and, New Bedford's School Committee suggested, they provided "those elements of knowledge which would best apply to the necessities of the probably circumscribed future of these children."[50]

---

[49] Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1875, pp. 442-43, and more generally, 191-450; New Bedford, School Report, 1881, pp. 36-37; ibid., 1880, pp. 33-35; New England Journal of Education, 1: 1/23/75, p. 52; Fall River, School Report, 1871-72, p. 16; ibid., 1872-73, pp. 47-49.

Indeed, the origin of New Bedford's mill school cogently revealed the validity of parental hostility. Segregated classes emerged in the city in 1872 as a synthesis of two distinct but related educational experiments. In 1869, the School Committee opened an ungraded school for youth who "cannot consistently be sent to the ordinary schools to mingle at will with their as yet uncontaminated members, and drop in the innocent paths of others the slime of their unfortunate deprivation. If we would preserve the purity and good standing of the public school system, such depraving association must not be!" Almost simultaneously, the city's evening schools were opened to mill children under 15 years of age. In both cases, however, the experiments were quickly terminated. The former was too explicitly a penal institution to be favorably received as a school, while the latter drove adults out of the evening classes and raised serious questions about requiring night school attendance for children who had labored all day.[51]

The mill classes thus emerged out of a dual concern to isolate delinquent children and provide classroom education for mill youth. In many people's eyes, and probably in those of New Bedford's school officials, the two groups--delinquents and mill children--

---

[50] Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, Annual Report, 1875, pp. 57-63; Fall River, School Report, 1876-77, pp. 6-7; Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, pp. 46-48; New Bedford, School Report, 1883, p. 23; Lintner, "Fall River," pp. 265-66.

[51] New Bedford, School Report, 1869, pp. 40-41; ibid., 1870, pp. 49-50; ibid., 1871, pp. 19-20.

overlapped and might even be considered synonymous. To claims that the mill school was dominated by truants and delinquents, the School Committee responded by declaring that neither group attended. Rather the student body consisted of immigrant children unable to speak English, an affirmation which probably did little to reassure the public. Moreover, while the mill school was designed to provide the same basic elementary education necessary for all children but denied factory youth, it needed, wrote the Superintendent, a course of study "specifically adopted to meet the wants of the class of pupils who attend them. The elements of a few essential branches thoroughly taught is worth more to these pupils than any attempt at the more extended course of the graded schools." In short, the problems of teaching mill children were so complex that one could not measure progress by the regular standards of the schools.[52]

The brief time span and restricted popularity of the mill and half time schools, from their inception in the late 1860's to disappearance in three of the five cities which had them by the end of the 1870's, cautions against undue emphasis upon their importance. In the cities in which they appeared--Salem, Springfield, Fall River, Lowell and New Bedford--their enrollments were limited and their relationship to the public school system tenuous. A variety of reasons--their explicit class basis, the frustrations of cooperating with the mills, the highlighting of absenteeism problems by focusing on a class of students most susceptible to truancy, and widespread feeling among the populace that they were preserves for delinquents--undermined whatever potential for expansion they possessed. But the mill classes are important for they reflected the emergence among a number of Massachusetts' urban educators of the notion that mill children needed special schools for their particular problems, and that the public school system itself was best served by such isolation. In this stark form, these conclusions were not widespread, but in a more generalized and amorphous form they would become pervasive. With the expansion of the compulsory education requirements--in 1876, children under 14 had to attend school for 20 rather than 13 weeks before industrial employment and after 1883, no child under 12 could be employed in the mills at any time--children of the factory became regular participants in the school process. Their deficiencies, the difficulties of teaching children of immigrants, once cited as reasons for separate schools, became endemic to the public schools of every major Massachusetts city, and the demand for special kinds of education to meet these deficiencies became, in the late nineteenth century, a major buttress of the manual education movement.

---

[52] Ibid., 1878, p. 23; ibid., 1881, pp. 39-40; ibid., 1882, p. 34; ibid., 1884, pp. 27-29; ibid., 1889, pp. 79-80.

## V

The mill schools provide some insight into an emerging theory of special education for particular groups in society, but they did not necessarily involve a movement away from the traditional public school curriculum to manual training. That development only occurred when Massachusetts' educators began applying previously accepted methods for schooling social deviants to the poor and immigrant of the state's cities.

In the decades after the Civil War, Massachusetts' school officials never challenged the widespread enthusiasm for manual education for the emancipated black. Manual training, wrote the headmaster of a Boston grammar school in 1887, was mandatory for Southern Negroes who lacked adequate home training and needed some instruction in basic manual skills to survive. "In schools where negroes and Indians are educated," wrote Brookline's reform-minded Superintendent of Schools, Samuel T. Dutton, "the results of combining manual and intellectual training are most significant. It is freely acknowledged, by those who have studied the problem most thoroughly, that the only hope of elevating the Indian and the African lies in a sort of industrial reformation."[53]

Considerably more important, however, than Southern blacks in leading Massachusetts' educators to affirm the relevance of manual training was its apparent applicability to the education of delinquent children. Even before the Civil War, training in manual skills had become integral to progressive reform attitudes toward delinquents, part of a new approach to the rehabilitation of youthful victims of poverty and corruption. Confronted with what it perceived to be the evils of urbanization, Massachusetts had founded a state reform school for boys in 1848 which sought to transform the individual's character by reconstructing an environment of rural family life for manual and moral training. The state, wrote George Martin, referring to the Lyman School for Boys (1848) and the Industrial School for Girls (1856), "has made ample provision to win back to lives of rectitude and usefulness (by judicious restraint and the regenerating influences of learning and labor) boys and girls who have taken the first steps in crime."[54]

Since environment, and particularly that of the city and the family of poverty, instituted evil, and contending that the rural family and its manual vocations could correct evils already established, pre-Civil War social reformers in Massachusetts called for special manual labor schools to prevent a corrupt environment from even taking effect.

---

[53] H. C. Hardon, "School, Home, and Life," Journal of Education, 25: 1/27/87, 53; Samuel T. Dutton, Social Phases of Education in the School and the Home (New York, 1899), p. 217.

[54] Martin, Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System, p. 225; Katz, Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 163-66, 185-206; Fisher, Industrial Education, pp. 38-43, 78-79.

The Industrial School For Girls in Winchester, for example, opened in 1853 as a philanthropic venture, attempted

> to provide, or begin a provision for a serious want existing in our city [Boston], by those most acquainted with the condition of the poor. Its object was to remove from their miserable homes children whose circumstances surrounded them with temptation, and whose education furnished them with no means of resistance; to train them in household labor; and to exert a moral influence and discipline over them which should fit them to be faithful and efficient in domestic service, or in any probable mode of gaining their own livelihood. There are many institutions strongly armed and appointed for the punishment of evil-doers. The object of this School is to prevent evil."[55]

Although emphasis on environment as a reshaper of social behavior declined in the years surrounding the Civil War, the idea that manual training in rural and handicraft skills acted as a counterforce to evil tendencies and actions among delinquents had become an accepted feature of Massachusetts' educational ideology by the 1880's. Hesitant to recommend manual training in his public schools, Fall River's Superintendent, in a representative statement in 1885, stated that he was "of the opinion that it should be introduced into our Truant School in some systematic form, so that the boys may acquire some knowledge of how to perform some kinds of manual labor."[56]

A few supporters of the widespread introduction of manual education into the public schools did object to this frequent association of hand learning with defectives and delinquents. "It is proposed," declared T. C. Amory of Boston, a strong advocate of public school manual education, "to teach boys in the reformatories mechanical employments. Would not this be placing a stigma on these industries, if no such instruction is provided anywhere else? It would be to reward the less meritorious for not being as good as the rest." More often, however, evidence of success with the acknowledged defectives of society justified expansion into the public schools. "Have we not, then, abundant proof that this element," asked Samuel Dutton, "which operates so powerfully in the enlightenment of the heathen and the savage, and in the reformation of the vicious and defective, should be a constant and somewhat prominent factor in public education?" Similarly, after recounting the benefits obtained by manual education among young inmates of the almshouse (usually there as a result of petty delinquencies), the mayor of Cambridge stated in 1887, "If this is the result with boys very young, most of whom are so incorrigible as to have utterly failed in other schools to make any progress,--how promising its success, if introduced as part of our public school system!"[57]

---

[55] Quoted in Industrial School for Girls, Dorchester, *Report of the Board of Managers*, 1873, pp. 5-6. See also *ibid.*, 1874, pp. 7-11; [Boston] *Farm and Trade School*, Thompson's Island, *Annual Reports*, 1852-1881, *passim.*; Bennett, *Manual... Education to 1870*, pp. 242-49.

[56] Fall River, *School Report*, 1884-85, p. 38; Samuel T. Dutton, "Education as a Preventive and Cure of Crime," American Institute of Instruction, *Proceedings*, 1886, pp. 22-24. See also David Snedden, *Administration and Educational Work of American Juvenile Reform Schools* (New York, 1907).

In a previous era these assertions, this broadening of manual training's ideology from defective and delinquent to the community at large, would have been achieved only with the greatest difficulty. Massachusetts' common schools were designed to inculcate the common values of a broad spectrum of American life. Those outside that spectrum, whether anti-socially deformed by environment or heredity, needed special care. The resolution of their particular problems would not have been applicable to the mass of healthy Americans. To give the child of the common school the same treatment accorded such social defectives as the delinquent and emancipated slave would have seemed a ludicrous reversal of common sense. During the 1870's and 1880's, the dominant question thus confronting manual education, and its major hurdle into the public schools, was whether it could overcome the connotation of special education for deficient children. Manual training as pedagogic reform helped in that process for it made hand learning applicable to all school children. Industrial drawing whose original purpose was to produce a group of more efficient industrial workers had to be metamorphosized into drawing for mental and moral discipline, and thus also justifiable for all school children. In this context, mill schools which explicitly proposed special and segregated education were unacceptable. The identification of manual training with social defectives would similarly have undermined it. However, by the late nineteenth century, Massachusetts' educators had concluded that the city itself contained large numbers of actual or potentially defective children. Particularly the children of immigrants, now dominating the state's urban school systems, seemed the victims of an environment and social condition which precluded healthy growth and social stability. Living in a society in which traditional relationships were being sundered, all children, but especially immigrant children, needed training in such basic values as work and self-reliance. It was this ideology, the sense of widespread institutional deficiency, which made manual education acceptable to Massachusetts' educators, and propelled it into the public schools.

---

[57] Amory quoted in *Boston Transcript*, 1/17/80, p. 3; Dutton, *Social Phases*, pp. 217-18; Cambridge, *Inaugural Address of Mayor*, 1887, p. 29.

## CHAPTER IV

## MANUAL TRAINING AND THE RESTORATION OF SOCIAL VALUES

### I

"To some extent," wrote Edwin Seaver in 1893,

> we may attribute the favorable reception manual training has had to its promise of becoming an acceptable substitute for apprenticeship now fallen into merited disuse; or its opening the way to industrial employments for the many whom circumstances now exclude; or to its great attractiveness for active boys; or to its excellence as physical exercise; or to its answering the somewhat vague demand for 'something practical' in education, or to its inculcating 'the true dignity of labor' and 'respect for the laborer.' Each of these causes has, undoubtedly, contributed something, and the total effect has been considerable. But there is a more powerful cause than any of these, or all of these together.

That cause lay in the deep-rooted conviction that "learning how to work and forming habits of industry are indispensable elements in the right education of every boy or girl." Historically, Seaver continued, New England had found that "outwardly productive and useful work of the hands" was essential to the "right intellectual and moral training of children, essential to the right training for citizenship in a free State," and, in an earlier rural environment, the home, shop, and school had combined to achieve these goals.[1]

Industrialization and urbanization, however, had disturbed the smooth integration of hand with intellectual and moral training. Increased demand in industry, Professor John Runkle of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology reported, "led to competition, to the invention of special tools to cheapen production, to a greater subdivision of labor, and to the concentration of the individual upon a very narrow range of work." Previously, George McNeill wrote,

---

[1] Massachusetts Board of Education, Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate the Existing Systems of Manual Training and Industrial Education (Boston, 1893), pp. 26-27. (Hereafter cited as Report on Manual Training.)

> the shoemaker made shoes, the carpenter built houses. Now a shoe operative repeats one process upon one given part of the shoe, and it takes about one hundred shoe operatives to make one shoe. The carpenter may be a floor layer, a door and sash maker or a finisher, but rarely will he be a carpenter and joiner. The wage worker of today, whether a hand tool or a steam or electric tool worker, is less and less required to depend upon himself in his work; his opportunity of development in his work are [sic] limited, as compared to those of former times.

Machinery had replaced hands, while the fragmentation of the labor process had led to the widespread denigration of labor itself. The shop, once an intimate of the home, had become the factory, with its employees functionally isolated from one another. The school and shop, once complements, Runkle concluded, "have become so widely separated, that they are no longer material helps, as in past times, in developing the highest capacity or the highest manhood."[2]

In the city, where children no longer communed with nature, no longer tested their bodies and minds in the woodshed and field, the isolation of institutions had placed a heavy burden upon the schools. In the cities, wrote Seaver, had come to exist "a profound educational want."

> All the people feel it. . . The city school, with its forty weeks of term time, has merely filled with more book learning the gap left by the departed home employments. The traditional balance between 'learning and labor' has been upset, and 'learning' has taken the whole time. . . Now, it is because people see or think they see

---

[2] John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," Massachusetts Board of Education, Forty-First Annual Report [1876-77], p. 186; George E. McNeill in Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 58-68.

> in manual training a means of repairing the loss and relieving the want by which they have felt so long oppressed that they have so heartily welcomed this new means of education.

"It was urged," Worcester's Superintendent of Schools told a National Education Association audience in 1896, "that continuous bodily effort was essential to the establishment of character or the training of the will. Our city civilization is weak and protoplastic because it lacks the effect of such effort. The systematic introduction of Manual Training appears to be the only remedy for this enervated condition of our city population; the only universal stimulus to ambition and original effort on the part of our children."[3] Admitting that rural areas might benefit from classroom manual training, to offset deteriorating institutional relationships and to lay a basis for efficient farm management, Massachusetts' educators assumed that the country still provided some contact with wholesome manual labor outside the school. In the city and factory, however, work neither included an acquaintance with nature nor secured the satisfaction of fashioning an object from raw material to completed product. To the provision of at least a minimal surrogate for this loss, supporters of manual education directed their attention.[4]

While manual training tended to idealize the New England artisan, it did so less out of respect for his skill as a craftsman, than out of the sense that the artisan, as a product of an integrated rural environment, personified the disciplinary values of work and seemed to stand in the starkest contrast to the factory laborer. In late nineteenth century Massachusetts, where industrial labor meant immigrants without skills and machine production, manual education was called upon to restore the dignity of work indigenous to an earlier rural society. It thus became necessary for all urban dwellers, rich and poor, native and immigrant, whose situation deprived them of labor in a natural environment. In the urban society, social worker Robert Woods declared, manual training would "bring the children of the wealthier classes in more intimate relationship with manual labor and so bridge the chasm now broadening so rapidly between the wealthy classes and the bread winners." "It is not so much the creation and endowment of separate schools," concluded Francis Walker before the Social Science Association in 1884, ". . . which is in view, as the gradual conversion of all existing schools of the land to this use through the grafting of certain studies and exercises upon the traditional curriculum." All children, regardless of their parental background and future goals, needed an acquaintance with systematic manual labor, and in the city, the only institution which seemed capable of providing that acquaintance was the public school.[5]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 29-30; Superintendent Carroll quoted in Isaac E. Clarke, *Art and Industry* (U. S. Senate, Executive Documents, 1897), 46th Congress, 2nd Session, vol. 7, part 3, p. xxxvi.

[4] John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element in Education," Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report,* 1880-81, p. 200. (This is an expansion of Runkle's earlier essay. See note 2 above.); Francis Walker, "Manual Education in Urban Communities," National Education Association, *Journal of Proceedings and Addresses,* 1887, p. 200; Walker, "A Plea for Industrial Education in the Public Schools," in Clarke, *Art and Industry*, part 2, pp. 789-90; H. C. Hardon, "School, Home, and Life," *Journal of Education*, 25: 1/27/87, 52-53; Clarke, part 2, pp. 227-228.

Thus justified, manual training became tied to the restoration of social values. It did not confront industrialization as productivity or industrial efficiency, but rather was concerned with the relationships between people and institutions and among institutions. Finding that industry and the city threatened social harmony and perverted the definition of work, manual educators called upon the school to restore and stabilize values.

---

[5] Robert Woods, "A Broader Education Required," The Arena, 1: 4/90, 627-28; Francis Walker quoted in Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, p. 38; Runkle, "Manual Element," 1880-81, pp. 133-34. See the suggestive comments in Isabella MacDougall, "Transformation of an Ideal: Boston Public Schools, 1888-91," unpublished honors thesis, Radcliffe College, 1967 in the Schlesinger Library, pp. 81-83.

Accepting the accomplishments of industrialization, they sought systematic and controlled physical activity to overcome the social precipitates of urban factory life. With this in mind, they turned to curriculum planning.[6]

At its best, the apprenticeship system had integrated technical knowledge, practical trade experience, and moral discipline within a basically familial setting. But for all its social value, the system had been economically inefficient, and had too often failed to teach effectively particular skills. Industrialization, moreover, had undermined the conditions which gave apprenticeship its strength, had rendered economic waste intolerable, and demanded skills to the exclusion of broader educational concerns. The factory had also placed a premium on the systemization of work. In its quest for efficiency, it divided the productive process into a series of logically connected tasks with each step adding to the complexity of the product as it moved from basic to more advanced stages. In human terms, however, the factory failed because only the product and not the individual underwent this process. The worker remained fixed at a particular position, his work specialized and simplified to prevent any real comprehension of the stages through which the product travelled. Without this understanding, he soon came to denigrate his role in production, and ultimately, labor itself. Simultaneously, those outside the factory saw the individual worker as a simple cog in the broader industrial process, and reached a similar attitude toward manual labor.[7]

---

[6] Daniel Horowitz, "Response to Industrialism," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1966, p. 189 argues that manual training's advocates rarely claimed it would aid economic growth, and justified manual instruction mainly in terms of alleviating the social problems of industrialization. The interpretation presented here supports that position. On the educators' vision of a previously functioning harmonious rural society, see above pp. 11-16.

[7] Charles A. Bennett, History of Manual and Industrial Education to 1870, (Peoria, 1926), p. 266; Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 72-73; Berenice Fisher, Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions (Madison, 1967), pp. 79-80.

Manual education acknowledged the factory's systemization of the work process as a valid basis for an industrial society. It accepted the premise that movement from simple to complex through a series of carefully constructed and graded steps was the most efficient means of production, but it reversed the object of the process from the product to the individual. Since each stage of manual training was designed to be instructional, to provide insight into the linkage between steps, and to yield training in the disciplinary values of work, efficient productivity could be temporarily foregone. Drill in the exercises of work, not completion of the object or knowledge about the trade, became the mainstay of manual training. "The system is instruction in the mechanical arts for the purpose of construction," wrote John Runkle who drew heavily upon the newly discovered Russian system of workshop education," and not construction for the purpose of instruction." In an industrial society, whose needs rapidly changed in unpredictable ways, learning how to work and discovering the principles which underlay the processes of production would be manual training's contribution to social stability.[8]

How this worked in practice can be seen in the woodworking programs, the most popular of the manual training experiments, adopted in Massachusetts before 1900. Reminiscent of a host of activities for rural males, woodworking possessed a number of appeals. The material and basic tools--hammer, plane, saw, chisel--were readily available and familiar to many children. Compared to metal, it was considerably less expensive to work with. Wood, wrote one of its leading advocates, "is conceded to be superior to any other manual-training material. It has, so to speak, more life than such materials as clay, paper, or metal. The material itself excites an interest in the children... It gives a measured resistance to the muscles, and can be adapted to the individual strength of the worker." Equally important, simple wood exercises could be conducted by the regular corps of teachers, the overwhelming majority of whom were female, with only limited special training, thus eliminating the financial burden of hiring a special corps of manual training instructors.[9]

---

[8] John D. Runkle, "The Manual Element," 1876-77, p. 188; Charles A. Bennett, History of Manual and Industrial Education, 1870 to 1917 (Peoria, 1937), pp. 13-47; Fisher, Industrial Education, p. 67; Clarke, Art and Industry, part 2, pp. 52-53; ibid., part 3, pp. 775-76.

Throughout the state, a variety of woodworking programs appeared between 1885 and 1900, but one of the most widely used was "sloyd." Originating in Norway and Sweden as a movement to revive rural handicrafts, sloyd was first introduced to Massachusetts' educators by M.I.T. Professor of Mathematics John Ordway in a series of papers published in the 1881-82 Annual Report of the State Board of Education. The Swedish word sloyd, Ordway pointed out, had no exact equivalent in the English language, but stood for hand work done with simple tools. In the Scandanavian countries it thus included a wide variety of manual activities, all aimed at producing finished products either for sale in the open market or to supply the schools. Originating around 1870 with the establishment of separate sloyd schools in Sweden, sloyd did not flourish until the end of the decade when it was introduced into the common schools, usually financed by local ad hoc sloyd education committees. At that time, sloyd began to lose some of its breadth and to concentrate upon woodworking activities as most suitable for classroom instruction.[10]

---

[9] Gustaf Larsson, Elementary Sloyd and Whittling (New York, 1906), p. 5; Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 23-24.

[10] Ordway's comments and articles on sloyd in Scandanavia appeared in Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1881-82, pp. 163-213. See also Bennett, Manual Education, 1870-1917, pp. 53-56.

Although the production of useful articles was of prime importance in its origin, by the early 1880's Swedish sloyd instruction emphasized the value of highly formalized and regular work exercises rather than the finished product. Its major goal turned from a restoration of traditional Scandanavian handicrafts to training the hand and the mind and reinvigorating attitudes toward manual labor. It would, its leading Swedish advocate declared, foster habits of neatness and methodic work. Thus transformed from a varied attempt to resuscitate handicraft production to woodworking exercises as a means of developing habits of industry, sloyd became an attractive curricula innovation to Massachusetts' manual training advocates.[11]

The message of sloyd, initiated by Professor Ordway, became a reality in Gustaf Larsson, a Swedish emigrant and "America's leading representative of the sloyd system of manual training." As a foreigner advocating a subject of European origin, Larsson's career could have paralleled Walter Smith's, but his sensitivity to the political liabilities of being an alien and the enthusiasm being generated for manual training in the late 1880's made Larsson's stay in Massachusetts considerably more effective. Like other manual activities, Larsson believed, sloyd synthesized physical labor, respect for work, self-reliance, concentration, and the power to make and execute plans, developing habits of order, accuracy, and neatness. Like drawing, he claimed, the reproduction of objects by carving models in wood created an allegiance to orderly forms of beauty and to acceptable aesthetic standards. Finally, sloyd depended upon a series of carefully graded and systematically constructed exercises which forced the student to move from the simple to the complex, from the raw material to completed object, in the basic interests of efficient education.[12]

---

[11] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1881-82, p. 165. Summaries of the development of sloyd in the United States, where it centered in Massachusetts, can be found in Ray Stombaugh, A Survey of the Movements Culminating in Industrial Arts Education (New York, 1936), pp. 90-102; Bennett, Manual Education, 1870-1917, pp. 62-66; Fisher, Industrial Education, p. 100. Otto Salomon, the leading proponent of sloyd as pedagogy rather than production, is discussed in Gustaf Larsson, "Otto Salomon, 1849-1907," Manual Training Magazine, 10: 12/08, 104-09 and Clarke, Art and Industry, part 2, pp. 884-888.

Although sloyd competed with other woodworking programs in the last quarter of the nineteenth century, particularly those patterned after the Russian workshop system, it possessed a distinct advantage over the others by urging the completion of objects. The Russian system, advocated by John D. Runkle and other manual training enthusiasts, fixated upon exercises: in wood, the carving of corners on a block, the chiseling of straight lines, the fitting together of joints. "It will be noticed," a report on a Boston woodworking class declared, "that no specific article was made in the school. The variety of manipulations and change of patterns were enough to maintain the freshness of the scholars' interest, without introducing the manufacture of any article of trade or commerce." To Larsson, exercises for the sake of manipulation failed to draw upon a basic pedagogical requirement: the student's interest in production. Only when children completed objects of practical use to themselves or their home, would they learn the habits of systematic work. Each sloyd exercise or series of exercises thus led to the completion of some useful object: a pen holder, tool rack, cutting board, picture frame, tool chest. In this way, Larsson argued, interest would be retained, fulfillment of a task achieved, and pride in workmanship effected.[13]

---

[12] The admiring reference to Larsson is from Manual Training Magazine, 5: 10/03, 68. Larsson expounded his system in numerous books, articles and addresses. See Gustaf Larsson, Sloyd (n.p., 1902); Sloyd for American Schools (n.p., 1894); and Elementary Sloyd and Whittling.

[13] Massachusetts Board of Education, Forty-First Annual Report [1876-77], p. 195; Runkel, "The Manual Element," ibid., p. 188; Larsson, Sloyd, pp. 13, 33-34, 56-57; ibid., Elementary Sloyd, pp. 3-4; Stombaugh, Industrial Arts Education, pp. 73-76, 98-101; Bennett, Manual Education, 1880-1917, pp. 67-69.

While Larsson and other supporters of sloyd tended to emphasize the differences between their system and other woodworking experiments, in practice, wood programs synthesized the commitment to definite and formal exercises with the production of small objects. What was important about sloyd was thus not its differences from other forms of woodworking instruction, but its contribution to enlarging the base of support for manual training, and its justification as a means of teaching the values of work. By the mid 1890's, only six years after Larsson had introduced sloyd to Boston, it was being taught in nine of 55 Boston grammar schools, as well as in the public schools of New Bedford, Haverhill, Medford, Dedham, and Milton. Graduates of Larsson's normal school course in sloyd, given gratuitously to any school teacher desiring it through the sponsorship of Mrs. Quincy Shaw, introduced the subject throughout the state.[14] Paralleling the expansion of sloyd instruction, were other woodworking classes in Boston, Springfield, Northampton, Waltham, and Salem, all functioning by the mid 1890's. At the end of the nineteenth century, instruction in the value of work and the orderly processes which underlay all work taught through the systematic manipulation of wood had become a regular feature of Massachusetts' public schools.[15]

---

[14] Larsson, Sloyd for American Schools, pp. 3-4, 11-12; ibid., Sloyd, p. 18; Manual Training Magazine, 2: 10/1900, 55-56; ibid., 5: 10/03, 62; Mario DiLeo, "North Bennet Street Industrial School," The [Boston] Italian News, June 7, 1963, in North Bennet Street Industrial School Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; North Bennet Street Industrial School, Annual Report, 1896, p. 4. (The Schlesinger Library has the complete files of the North Bennet Street School.) On the School itself see below pp. 175-88.

[15] Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, pp. 24-25 and Appendices B, C, H, and M; Bennett, Manual Training, 1870-1917, pp. 402-11.

## II

Whereas the rural male's manual education had once been secured in the shop and field, the family had traditionally provided for the female. As had occurred with the shop, however, the urban-industrial family had lost its ability to secure systematic work for its daughters, threatening, in turn, further deterioration of family life. If classroom manual training was to be successful, it thus had to provide more than woodworking for boys, had to compensate for the disruption of the family by providing instruction for girls. In this task, not surprisingly, the relationship of manual education to the deficiencies of the urban poor became explicit.

The belief that females should be acquainted with the fundamentals of domestic life, particularly sewing, was hardly novel to post-bellum Massachusetts. Social reformers before the Civil War had called upon mothers to practice and teach thrift and economy to their daughters by engaging in home sewing. Reformers concerned with reinvigorating the family similarly believed that special sewing classes or instruction in the common schools would offset the dissipating effects of urbanization and industrialization. Acting on a petition from a group of philanthropic ladies of the Seamen's Aid Society in 1835, for example, the Boston School Committee had even authorized sewing instruction in the city's grammar schools. Neither this decision, however, nor a subsequent attempt in the 1850's by the Committee to invigorate instruction by requiring it in one grade of the grammar schools appears to have stimulated much enthusiasm or teaching of the subject. Although small sums were allocated for salaries and materials, instruction before the Civil War was haphazard, left to the discretion of individual schoolmasters, most of whom revealed little interest in revising their course of study.

The mid 1860's brought a renewal of concern about the subject stimulated by Mrs. Mary Hemenway, a prominent Boston philanthropist, whose offer to finance sewing instruction for older girls in the Winthrop Grammar School in the working class South End was readily accepted by the school's headmaster. Almost simultaneously, the headmaster of the Shurtleff Grammar School in South Boston ordered that all girls in the three lower grades of the school be taught the subject with the girls bringing the materials, except in cases of dire poverty, and the school system providing the teacher. For the next few years, while ostensibly required in all grammar schools, sewing remained limited to Winthrop and Shurtleff, the city's other headmasters quietly ignoring the system-wide directive to teach the subject. In the mid 1870's, the School Committee again moved to extend sewing instruction, and formally authorized funds for special teachers. After a brief legal controversy during which the Committee was denied authority to provide school funds for a subject not required in the state syllabus, the state legislature opened the way for extensive instruction by resolving in 1876 that sewing could be taught in the public schools of any city or town at the discretion of the school committee.[16]

Until 1876, then, sewing, while recognized as necessary for adequate family life, had not been integral to the curriculum of the Boston public schools or those of any other Massachusetts city. Seemingly a dramatic break from the traditional course of study, opposed as an unnecessary expense, it made little headway because most educators assumed that sewing was or should be taught at home. By the end of the 1870's, however, that belief, based on the once secure notion of stable family life, had been undermined. With the new legislation of 1876, sewing moved to a regular though still tangential place in the Boston schools, and subsequently in the schools of Massachusetts' other major cities. In Boston, all girls in the fourth through sixth grades were authorized to attend sewing classes, and by 1888 there were 30 special teachers of the subject in the school system. Four years later, 12,225 students (594 boys) in the public schools received sewing instruction from one to two hours per week. "No part of manual training," wrote the superintendent of schools in 1888, "is more satisfactory in its immediate results than the sewing. Training the eye and both hands (differing from drawing in this), and carried on at very little expense, this industrial work is assuming its true place as a valuable educational influence." "This instruction is useful to all, both rich and poor," he continued, "encouraging habits of carefulness and industry; developing a taste for quiet, regular employment; furnishing a resource against idleness; and adding largely to the power of self support." "It is astonishing," concluded Lucretia P. Hale of the Boston School Committee,"how much is learned by the instruction of two hours a week, because it is systematic and regular."[17]

---

[16] Boston, Documents of the School Committee, 1881, #24, pp. 6-10; Boston, Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1888, pp. 72-74. (Hereafter annual reports of school committees and superintendents of schools will be cited as School Report.) Mrs. Hemenway, like Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw, was an important Brahmin supporter of educational causes, especially cooking, sewing, and physical training in the schools. See Mary Hemenway, A Memorial of the Life and Benefactions of Mary Hemenway, 1820-1894 (privately printed, 1927).

The justifications for classroom instruction thus combined some of the themes that appeared in the drawing, pedagogical reform, and woodworking movements: disciplining the hand and mind, encouraging work habits, strengthening the values associated with work. But if sewing had utility for all, its particular applicability to the poor provided its most important rationale. Headmaster Robert Swan of the Winthrop School, sewing's leading advocate and the educator most responsible for the subject's place in the school system, considered sewing's benefit for the poor preeminent. His colleague, H. C. Hardin, headmaster of the Shurtleff School, similarly affirmed in 1876 that "there are thousands of girls in those schools where sewing is popular [largely his own and the Winthrop School], clad in garments that their own hands had wholly or largely made in the public schools. Where pinching poverty and family care are too much for the mother's strength, who shall say that some of these girls are not now alive by means of self-help, ready to praise God, and take courage for their success in fighting the tiger of want." The subject, he concluded, had therefore achieved popularity "among the poorest."[18]

---

[17] Boston, School Documents, 1881, #24, pp. 10-17; Boston, School Report, 1888, pp. 74-75; Boston, School Documents, 1892, #12, pp. 36-42. Mrs. Hale is quoted in Clarke, Art and Industry, part 2, p. 992. See also L. H. Marvel, Manual Education in the Public Schools (Boston, 1882), pp. 10-11 and the comments by Medford's Superintendent of Schools, Ephraim Hunt in Journal of Education, 31: 5/22/90, 323.

In the other Massachusetts' cities, sewing's identification with the needs and failings of the poor was even more pronounced. In Worcester, the subject was introduced into schools in the poorest districts in 1878, and a committee on the subject reported that while its goals were universal, including healthful recreation as a stimulant to school work, gains in personal tidiness and cleanliness, and training of the hand and eye to precision and neatness, these all had a particular applicability to the children of the poor. "Nothing adds more to the household comfort, is more indispensable to the tidiness and decency of home, than this poor despised, neglected, and, among our poorest people, lost art of good hand-sewing. That it might be revived, and made a reformatory power through the homes of our school-children, was my desire in introducing elementary sewing into Worcester public schools." Similarly, in Fall River, sewing was first introduced into the schools catering to the children of factory workers in 1875 because the girls who went to work in the mills lacked the opportunity to learn at home. In both Cambridge and Lowell, it moved into the public grammar schools as an extension of already existing charity classes.[19]

---

[18] New England Journal of Education, 2: 10/23/75, 189; H. C. Hardon, "Scholarship in the Boston Schools: Is It Advancing or Retrograding," ibid., 3: 1/1/76, 1-2.

Some of the most extended discussion of this relationship between the poor and classroom instruction in sewing occurred in New Bedford where a highly articulate superintendent of schools and his school committee combined cultural and economic arguments to introduce the subject into the schools. In his 1877 Annual Report, Superintendent Henry Harrington, citing Boston's and Cambridge's example, called for the adaptation of the schools to the social needs of their constituents. Girls with sewing instruction, he wrote, could become better domestic servants, learn thrift, and be saved from the degradation and self-destruction which accompanies ignorance of work skills. Following a brief period of quiescence, Harrington returned to the offensive in 1882, providing perhaps the most complete statement of the subject's social implications.[20]

Beginning with the assumption that sewing was neglected among New Bedford's families, particularly in the poorer classes, he asserted that the resulting ignorance caused the "unthrift and ragged shiftlessness of many homes,"and prevented girls who "go out to service, from obtaining any except the lowest places." Ignorance of sewing, moreover, prevented home manufacture of clothing, thus increasing the cost of living among the poor. These conditions helped break down self-respect, and led to a general unhappiness and discomfort. Although sewing would cause some disruption of the regular class work, Harrington claimed, the school's responsibility to remedy some of the social conditions of poverty demanded action. The conflict, he concluded, lay between "character-training and mental-training," and the former depended upon sewing in the schools. New Bedford delayed implementing Harrington's proposals for a year, but in May, 1883, at the urging of ladies "connected with the charities of the city," voted to require the subject in grades three through six for one hour a week. Two years later, a school committee member declared, "It is with feeling almost exultant that we realize that one half at least of the children in our schools are being taught one thing which will obtain them a livelihood when other resources fail."[21]

---

[19] "Report of the Committee on Sewing in the Worcester Schools," in Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1878-79, pp. 349-50; Sylvia Chace Lintner, "A Social History of Fall River," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Radcliffe College, 1945, p. 295; Cambridge, School Report, 1877, p. 9; ibid., 1879, p. 16; ibid., 1889, pp. 31-32; Cambridge Chronicle, 2/15/79, p. 8; ibid., 1/15/87; Lowell, School Report, 1890, p. 48.

[20] New Bedford, School Report, 1877, pp. 72-73.

Although sewing's advocates occasionally referred to this vocational aim, before 1900 they tended, as had Superintendent Harrington, to stress the subject's value for character-building and social restoration. Like the kindergarten slum child, daughters of the immigrant and the poor trained in the mechanics of "plain" sewing would bring to their homes the values of systematic work and thus reinvigorate the family life of the impoverished. Not until after 1900 would vocational goals become a prominent feature of the sewing movement, and then it involved the use of sewing machines and altogether different conceptions of work and the school's relationship to work. As part of the manual training movement before the turn of the century, however, sewing reflected a commitment to moral elevation, industriousness, the resuscitation of family life, and an attempt to integrate the urban poor into society through instruction in traditional skills rather than as a basis for economic mobility and social advancement.[22]

---

[21] Ibid., 1882, pp. 86-91; ibid., 1883, pp. 36-37; ibid., 1885, pp. 31-32.

## III

The emergence of cooking in the public school classroom paralleled sewing's development. Like the latter, it began as a philanthropic response to the disorientation and fragmentation of the urban family. Through it, the poor would be taught thrift, nutrition, and cleanliness; for the rich, acquaintance with the tools of the kitchen provided an introduction to the joys of domestic life and eliminated too frequent dependence upon a servant class. Like the other manual training activities, cooking was thus seen as a means of blurring class divisions, but it too quickly became directed at the social conditions and cultural mores of the poor. In Boston's South End, a school teacher told settlement worker Emily Balch that the homes of her students demanded that cooking and housekeeping lessons be given. In the immigrant North End, Boston's supervisor of cooking found conditions "are such as to make it desirable to extend instruction in cookery and the household arts. . . ." "It is believed, among those conversant with the domestic life of those of the lower rounds in our great cities," concluded H. C. Hardon, headmaster of Boston's Shurtleff Grammar School and a strong supporter of sewing instruction, "that, among some, not a little part of the inefficiency, sickness, loss of time, desire for drink from insufficient nutrition, is caused by a badly chosen use of money in the purchase and in bad preparation of food. . . To reform the household, among those whose knowledge of cooking stands nearly at zero, is a reformation worth working for. . . ."[23]

---

[22] Boston, School Documents, 1887, #17, p. 37. Even after 1900, when the vocational goals of sewing became prominent, "knowledge of the use of the needle" in the interests of family life remained a frequently expressed goal. See, e.g., Fall River, School Report, 1910, p. 98. On vocational training for girls, see below pp. 257-65.

As occurred with all of the manual education experiments, initiative for classroom instruction came from Boston. Following a brief experiment with privately sponsored free classes on Saturday mornings and evenings in the early 1880's, Mrs. Mary Hemenway, already supporting sewing instruction, opened a cooking class in a South End school in 1885. With the city providing the room, Mrs. Hemenway met all expenses "with the expectation," wrote a South End principal, "that the results would be so satisfactory that the school committee would soon take the responsibility of this, as well as start others, as needed, in different parts of the city." In a basement room, 32' x 30', fitted as a "first-class kitchen" with a gas stove, 12 individual burners, various kitchen utensils, and a "museum of analyzed foods," 30 girls daily received instruction in cooking and housekeeping. "Especial pain," reported the principal, "is continually taken to inculcate habits of neatness as well as economy." Within a few months, following the pattern of the sewing classes a few years earlier, a second "School Kitchen" was opened in the North End at the North Bennet Street Industrial School, with the costs assumed by the kindergarten philanthropist, Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw. By 1887, four "School Kitchens" jointly supported by the school system and philanthropists provided instruction for 900 Boston school girls in "plain cooking of the common and inexpensive articles of food" for one to two hours per week. Within a few years, the number had doubled to 1800, unevenly spread through the city with concentration in the immigrant and working class districts.[24]

---

[23] Boston, School Documents, 1892, #21, pp. 19-20; Denison House Papers, folder 3, diary ms., 1/3/93, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; Boston, School Documents, 1903, #3, p. 182; H. C. Hardon, "The School as it is, and the Necessity for Manual and Industrial Training," American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1889, pp. 92-93. See also Robert Woods, The City Wilderness (Boston, 1898), pp. 71-72; Anna Barrows, "Is the Cooking School Needed?", Journal of Education, 33: 1/1/91, 4-5; Springfield, School Report, 1903, p. 15.

Developments in other Massachusetts cities paralleled those in Boston, following the latter by about a decade. After observing classes in Boston and Cambridge, Haverhill's School Committee instituted limited cooking and sewing instruction as "universal needs" as well as sloyd for grammar school children in 1893. The same year, Springfield and New Bedford opened their cooking classes, occasions which the superintendents of both cities believed of the highest significance. Thomas Balliet of Springfield considered the classes "the most important step in education taken this year," while New Bedford's William Hatch thought it "an event of mark in the history of our schools," and one whose good effects would be quickly felt in the homes. A year earlier, Lynn had responded to pressure from the city's Associated Charities, which had maintained a cooking class in cooperation with the School Committee, by requesting its incorporation into the school curriculum.[25]

As the nineteenth century ended, then, the education of females for domestic life had received substantial justification as an integral feature of public education. "Upon the education of the American school girl," wrote a leading sponsor of domestic economy classes, "depends the future of the American home." Necessary to preserve the stability of urban family life, to inculcate the values and discipline of work, sewing and cooking became particularly applicable to the poor. To a great extent, both subjects entered Massachusetts' public schools through charitable and philanthropic agencies, and indeed, institutionalization as a school subject appears closely related to the initial financing by these external agents.[26]

---

[24] Granville B. Putnam, "Boston School Kitchens," Journal of Education, 24: 12/16/86, 383; Boston, School Documents, 1886, #3, pp. 52-53; ibid., #15, pp. 4-5; ibid., #19, pp. 17-19; ibid., 1887, #22, p. 8; ibid., 1889, #3, pp. 5-11; Journal of Education, 31: 2/27/90, 134; ibid., 37: 3/23/93, 185. By 1903, most grammar schools in Boston provided some cooking instruction for seventh and eighth grade girls; however, distribution was very uneven throughout the city. Boston, School Documents, 1903, #3, pp. 107-10.

[25] Haverhill, School Report, 1893, pp. 28-33; Balliet in Journal of Education, 38: 8/24/93, 123; New Bedford, School Report, 1893, p. 85; Lynn, School Report, 1892, pp. 33-34. See also Journal of Education, 26: 9/15/87, 154.

The commitment to social restoration, however, was not limited to instruction in household subjects. Manual training as an educational movement--wood working, school gardening, as well as sewing and cooking--sought to restore social values disrupted by the city and industrialization, with the public schools acting as the agencies of restoration. "In tenement-house districts," wrote Robert Woods in phrases reiterated by almost every supporter of manual education,

> manual training is a particularly hopeful form of education. . . [It] is corrective and uplifting. If the streets and gang life tend to make boys irresponsible and destructive, then there is specially needed in the tenement-house neighborhoods some interesting creative work. Children left to their natural impulses, provided they have the materials, always turn to making things. Unfortunately, the boys of this locality have few tools or little material with which to make things. Circumstances develop their destructive side. Manual training. . . is the enemy of indifference and willfulness, because every step requires self-control, thoughtfulness, care. A thing created means for the boy added self-respect. . . All this is not merely theory; five years experience in manual training with just such boys as have been described verifies every statement made.

Massachusetts' educators often hesitated to claim that the benefits of manual training to the children of "tenement-house districts" went far beyond those gained by other urban children. But while they tended to argue that urban life threatened the institutions and values of all, and therefore all were aided by instruction in the principles of manual labor, they frequently added that the immigrant-poor were most in need of such training. The oscillation back and forth was confusing, but by supporting the broad needs of urban children, it allowed disparate groups to remain committed to a common school ideology which demanded that all subject matter have some applicability to all children, while offering manual training to particularly deprived children.[27]

---

[26] Ellen H. Richards, "Domestic Economy as a Factor in Public Education," in Massachusetts Board of Education, Report on Manual Training, Appendix N.

## IV

Thus defined as a mechanism of social restoration, it is not surprising that most of the initiative and early responsibility for manual education, like the early stages of the kindergarten, should have come from Massachusetts' social philanthropists. Sewing and cooking instruction entered classrooms through the transfer of philanthropically instituted programs to the public schools on a shared cost basis. Early woodworking experiments were often conducted by "industrial education" associations who received permission to use public school facilities for their programs. This policy of private initiative and cost sharing between philanthropists and city government appeared throughout Massachusetts. In the mid-1890's, Fall River's mayor proudly asserted that his city's high school manual training program owed its existence to the munificence of a single individual. In 1891, Lowell's School Committee hoped "that in this city, where there is so much wealth and where industrial achievements have been so remarkable, we may have some citizens who will give a sum of money to inaugurate this improvement [manual training in the high school]." A year later, the Committee again pleaded with the city's affluent, so that the school system would not have to undertake any experiments on its own. The practice of philanthropic aid to public education in support of manual training had become so widespread and popular by the 1890's that the Journal of Education asked the state's wealthier citizens to continue and even increase their contributions.[28]

---

[27] Woods, The City Wilderness, pp. 237-38; Barbara M. Solomon, Pioneers in Service (Boston, 1956), p. 22.

Undoubtedly the most dramatic example of philanthropic initiative and involvement in manual education, revealing the amorphous line between public and private, was the founding of Cambridge's Manual Training High School in 1888. Woodwork classes for boys had been introduced in Cambridge as early as 1880 by a philanthropically established Industrial School Association to provide instruction "as a charity, with the hope of benefitting such poor boys as attended no other school, or were not advancing well in the literary work of the public schools, and who, it was hoped, might be reached and improved or reclaimed by manual training." Financed through private donations and $1.00 fee for 20 two-hour lessons, provided with a rent-free room by the city, the Association opened its after-school woodworking classes in January, 1880 to 72 boys. The program, however, soon proved inadequate. By June, 1880, attendance was down to 26, and for the next three and a half years the proportion of losses each semester continued or increased. Moreover, the Association found the wealthier students and those already succeeding in their regular school work more responsive to the instruction than the poor. While separate classes at $5.00 tuition charge were being established for more affluent children, boys either delinquent or unsuccessful in the public schools were being expelled from the manual training program as disciplinary problems. Finally, four years after its inception, the Association offered to equip and finance manual instruction if the city's public school system agreed to incorporate hand learning into its curriculum, a proposal accepted by the latter. Two years later, in 1886, the School Committee assumed full responsibility for the manual program and the Industrial School Association expired.[29]

---

[28] Fall River, Inaugural Address of the Mayor, 1895, pp. 19-20; Lowell, School Report, 1891, p. 15; ibid., 1892, pp. 50-52; Journal of Education, 38: 7/13/93. See also L. H. Marvel, Manual Education, p. 22 on the philanthropic introduction of woodworking into the Gloucester public schools and Industrial Education Association, "Manual Training at Springfield, Massachusetts," Educational Leaflet #4 (New York, 1888). A convenient summary of the introduction of woodworking into the Boston schools is in Bennett, Manual Education, 1870-1917, pp. 402-11. Philanthropic initiative was not unique to Massachusetts, although it appears to have been undertaken more prominently there than in other states. See Stombaugh, Industrial Arts Education, pp. 47-50, 61-68. For some suggestive comments on the role of philanthropy in "uplift" and education, see Berenice Fisher, "Education and Philanthropy," Teachers College Record, 68: May 1967, 622-30.

Thus far Cambridge's experience paralleled Boston's. Initiative from outside the school system, shared costs and responsibility, followed by full incorporation into the public schools. The establishment of Cambridge's Manual Training High School, however, marked a significant expansion of philanthropic innovation in public education. In June 1887, Frederick Rindge, the only surviving son of a wealthy Cambridge businessman and banker, offered land and construction costs for a new public library. The 28 year old Rindge, residing since 1882 in Los Angeles, had received about three million dollars upon the death of his parents in 1883 and 1885. Four months after the library offer, it was reported that Mayor William E. Russell, a former Harvard classmate of the philanthropist, had asked Rindge to add the land adjoining the proposed library to his gift for the construction of a new public high school. The latter obliged, and also agreed to construct the new school as well as a new city hall. To make each public building--the library, school, and city hall--a "monument to truth," he requested that the walls be inscribed with various didactic statements. As to the new high school, he urged, "I wish the plain arts of industry to be taught in the school. I wish the school to be especially for boys of average talents, who may in it learn how their arms and hands can earn food, clothing, and shelter for themselves [and later for their families]. . . I wish also that in it they may become accustomed to being under authority, and be now and then instructed in the laws that govern health and nobility of character. I urge that attendance to said school be given only to strong boys who will grow up to be able workingmen."[30]

---

[29] Cambridge Chronicle, 2/23/84; Cambridge, School Report, 1884, p. 18; ibid., 1886, pp. 22-23; ibid., 1888, pp. 27-28; ibid., 1894, pp. 55-60.

On the surface the school grant, while munificent, did not break with what was rapidly becoming an accepted relationship between manual training and public education. The grants, Cambridge's mayor declared in his 1888 inaugural address, were "to establish a school, where children of humble parents may be helped to earn a livelihood by honorable labor; to aid the city in giving advanced education to her children; to found a library, which carried education everywhere; and finally, to give a city hall, the center of municipal activity. . . ." The new manual training school was open only to students who had entered Cambridge English High School, and who once enrolled had the option of receiving three hours of manual instruction a day, attracting three-fourths of the entering class at English in 1890-91.[31]

The Manual Training School thus received public school pupils enrolled in the less college-oriented high school in the city and was considered part of the public system. Its administration and financing, however, were not under the jurisdiction of the public authorities. Manual Training was "under the immediate control of a Committee appointed by him [Rindge] to carry into execution his plans." That is, Rindge retained full authority over curriculum, appointments, financing, and all other administrative details. The School's position within the public system remained anomalous in the extreme. "Although the manual training school is supported by private munificence," the Cambridge School Committee tried to explain in 1895, "and the mechanical work is carried on under the direction of a superintendent responsible only to the founder, it is, nevertheless, in its essential features, a part of the public school system. All who take the regular course are enrolled as pupils of the English high school, and their academic work is carried on under the direction of the principal of that school." With Rindge remaining in California and in practice exerting little influence over the daily operations of his school, the inconsistencies of a privately controlled school within the public system were never tested and a full elaboration of the relationship never provoked. In 1899, ten years after its opening, Rindge turned full responsibility and control of Manual Training over to the city, eliminating the ambiguity of a decade.[32]

---

[30] Cambridge Chronicle, 6/18/87, 10/29/87, 11/19/87; Cambridge, School Report, 1887, p. 26; Ashton R. Willard, "The Rindge Gifts to Cambridge," New England Magazine, new series, 3: 2/91, 763-78; John W. Wood, "Frederick Hastings Rindge," Cambridge Historical Society, Publications, 34: 1951-52, 97-110.

[31] Cambridge, Inaugural Address of the Mayor, 1888, p. 4; Willard, "Rindge Gifts," pp. 775-76.

## V

The Rindge School represented the most dramatic example of philanthropic control over public school innovation. More revealing, however, of the close relationship between manual education as social restoration and philanthropy, and the shape which the latter was giving to urban education was the North Bennet Street Industrial School in Boston's immigrant North End. The central agency of charity for Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw, by the 1880's Boston's leading benefactor of education, including on its Board of Advisors some of Boston's leading Brahmins, educators like G. Stanley Hall, Francis Walker, and Edwin Seaver, and receiving financial support from a host of prominent citizens, North Bennet Street drew visitors from around the world. The School's various activities gave strong support to those asserting the association between manual training and the educational needs of the immigrant poor, and helped lay the basis for expanded hand learning and other educational innovations in Boston's schools. Its success in providing manual instruction, wrote Robert Woods, "did much to force that training into the public schools." At the same time, while American educators were trying to differentiate parochial and public education, and were rejecting proposals for "shared-time" instruction, North Bennet Street and the Boston School Committee adopted a system of "released-time" education for manual training which continued to confuse the relationship between public and private well into the twentieth century.[33]

---

[32] Cambridge, School Report, 1888, p. 43; ibid., 1895, p. 43; ibid., 1899, p. 35.

The North Bennet Street School originated in the early 1880's as an outgrowth of the Associated Charities movement, a federation of Boston charity organizations begun in 1879 and committed to the rationalization of relief and the elimination of poverty. Charities sought the former by registering all welfare recipients at a central source, thus preventing duplication of aid and excessive welfare free-loading. The elimination of poverty seemed more complex, but essentially the federation's sponsors argued that the causes of poverty and the origins of social misery lay in an aversion to labor and an unwillingness among certain individuals to engage in work while other means of survival remained available. Under the motto, give "not alms, but a friend, not gifts, but employment," volunteer agents of the Charities--friendly visitors"--combined the provision of odd jobs, especially sewing and laundering, with home visits for moral sustenance, thereby seeking to differentiate more effectively the deserving and undeserving poor.[34]

---

[33] DiLeo, "North Bennet Street Industrial School," April 26, 1963; Woods, Americans in Process (Boston, 1902), p. 345. Among the members of the School's Advisory Board in 1888 were Mr. and Mrs. Henry L. Higginson, George Higginson, Amy M. Homans, William Endicott, Jr., Henry Lee, Mrs. Louis Agassiz. In the 1890's, visitors to the School included John Dewey, John D. Rockefeller, Jr., school officials from other Massachusetts cities, and at least two European educators. North Bennet Street Industrial School, Annual Report, 1888; ibid., "Visitors Book, 1893-[1903]"; ibid., "Annual Subscriptions," 1888-99. An excellent summary of the Industrial School's history can be found in a series of articles by Mario DiLeo published in The [Boston] Italian News, April 26 to November 8, 1963. Unless otherwise noted, all North Bennet Street Industrial School material is on file at the Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Centering much of its energy in the immigrant North End, the experiment in eliminating poverty was threatened from its inception. "The people did not want to work; and if, by chance, any of them had ambition to do something, they did not know how." Finding neither their laundry nor their sewing adequately performed, and confronted with widespread apathy toward their relief program, the ladies of the Associated Charities moved to combine work opportunities with training in skills by establishing a small laundry and a sewing instruction-production class. Under the motto "Might we not train these unskilled masses, and thus create a demand for them and their labor?", the laundry room--with a small fee for the soap, starch, and facilities--

---

[34] The goals and methods of the Associated Charities movement can be found in Robert Treat Paine, Jr., Address of the President of the Associated Charities of Boston, 3/12/79; Associated Charities of Boston, Circular Letter to Sewing Societies, 10/20/79; ibid., First Annual Report, 1880; ibid., Rules and Suggestions for Visitors of the Associated Charities, revised, 1884. See also Nathan I. Huggins, "Private Charities in Boston, 1870-1900," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1962, pp. 82-120. On the development of "scientific philanthropy," see Robert H. Bremner, American Philanthropy (Chicago, 1960), pp. 89-104.

and the sewing program--which provided instruction for young girls with machines sold to them at reduced cost--became the focus of organized charity in the North End. Simultaneously, a committee of the Charities called for the creation of "a public feeling in favor of introducing into the public schools. . . simple and fundamental industrial training" to help instill work values before individuals had to call upon charity.[35]

Opened as the North End Industrial Home in 1880, the sewing and laundry programs quickly expanded to incorporate other activities. To care for the children of those at work, a nursery and kindergarten were established. To improve the domestic life of the poor, a kitchen-garden, cooking classes, and a cafe which prepared economical and wholesome meals for workers opened. The same conditions which had led to the establishment of the sewing and laundry rooms--aversion to work and lack of skills--led to carpentry and printing classes for young males which similarly combined instruction and production. A circulating library, reading and amusement rooms soon provided for the cultural and social improvement of the district. Such innovations, however, were never undertaken haphazardly. In keeping with the goal of differentiating the deserving and undeserving poor, the sewing classes which had been opened indiscriminately to 150 girls were soon made available only to widows, deserted wives, and wives with sick husbands. Donations of cast-off clothing, assiduously sought by the Charities' ladies, functioned as material for learning, but also became payment for a "moderate equivalent in work." Women in the laundry room paid a fee equal to 10% of their income for the facilities and once having learned the art of laundering and "having earned enough to supply herself with necessary furnishings," their places went to others who proved their needs and work qualities. The garden, cooking classes, and cafe drew upon one another to function as economic units. At the North End Industrial Home, Frank Leslie's Illustrated Magazine reported in 1881, "the unskilled poor, young and old, male and female, are taught things practical, whereby to earn bread to render them independent of alms, and to keep them out of the horrible clutches of beggary. . . .In the very midst of the North End. . . women, girls, and boys of the very poor classes are taught a variety of things and from which they graduate better work-people and better able to fight the hard fight for life."[36]

---

[35] North Bennet Street, Annual Report, 1881, pp. 9-10; Associated Charities, Report of the Committee on Industrial Training, 5/16/81; "The North End Industrial Home," Frank Leslie's Illustrated Newspaper, 6/4/81, p. 3 (in North Bennet Street files at Schlesinger Library); DiLeo, 'North Bennet Street," 4/26/63, 5/10/63.

The North End Industrial Home thus began as an institutionalized extension of the movement to rationalize charity, providing a setting within which the deserving poor could simultaneously learn and earn, thereby raising themselves out of poverty. Increasingly, however, the Home's sponsors turned away from the provision of work, the use of facilities for production and income, toward formal instruction. By the mid 1880's, the work of adult women and out-of-school youth had taken a secondary place to the teaching of practical arts to school age children. "One of the first lessons learned here, as elsewhere," a report of the Home declared, "has been that the inability to do anything well is the cause of most of the poverty and much of the crime in the world; hence to give industrial training, with all its invigorating and educating influences, to those who are both willing and young enough to learn, has become the first, but not the only aim of the work." Between 1885 and 1887, the laundry as a workshop and place of business was eliminated, the sewing classes, now instituted in the Boston grammar schools, dropped, and in recognition of its changing function, the Industrial Home's title changed to the North Bennet Street Industrial School. And, most important, emphasis on its teaching functions led the Industrial School into an intimate relationship with the Boston public school system, resulting by the end of the 1880's in its attainment of a prominent place in the city's educational structure as a key adjunct to that system.[37]

---

[36] North Bennet Street, Annual Report, 1881-87, pp. 24-30; "The North End Industrial Home."

The movement toward involvement with the public schools reflected a synthesis of Boston's growing concern for manual training and the Industrial Home's dissatisfaction with the progress of the first few years. During the 1870's and 1880's, as we have seen, Boston made sewing and cooking a regular feature of its public school curriculum. At the same time, the city had become engaged in an ad hoc arrangement with a philanthropically sponsored Industrial Education Association to provide woodworking classes in one of its grammar schools. In 1881, under an agreement between the Association and the Boston School Committee, 36 boys were released from their regular classrooms for two hours a week and given manual training instruction in a basement classroom of the Dwight School, with the Association financing the experiment. "In arranging the practical details of the school," wrote the principal of the School, ". . . it had been agreed that school discipline should be maintained throughout the sessions; that the programme should be carefully written out on the blackboard; that each boy should be marked on the work done, and that a record of it should be kept."

> From this beginning to the close the school went on with unbroken and successful regularity. The teacher was promptly on hand, the order was good, the pupils interested. It was delightful to see the eager desire manifested everywhere in the room to do the day's work well. There was no absence, no tardiness. On one occasion a count was made, and 17 out of 18 pupils were found at work at one o'clock, when two was the hour for beginning.

---

[37] "North Bennet Street Industrial School," [1886], newsletter in School's files; North Bennet Street, Annual Report, 1881-87, p. 5.

Despite prior apprehensions, Headmaster James A. Page continued, regular school work was not affected by the time spent in manual instruction. On a few occasions when a student seemed to be falling behind, "the pupil, in every case, was so anxious to remain in the 'carpenter's class,' that a word or two of warning was sufficient to bring his performance up to standard again."[38]

Little doubt existed in Headmaster Page's mind of the experiment's success. The manual training class "was visited by a large number of ladies and gentlemen, some of them from distant parts of the country, and many of them anxious to learn the details of the plan upon which the school was carried forward. It was also visited by members of the School Board, the Superintendent of Schools, and by many educators of all grades; thus showing a wide-spread interest in the general question of manual training in the public schools." "I consider," Page concluded, "that the results go far to prove that manual training is so great a relief to the iteration of school work that it is a positive benefit, rather than a detriment, to the course in the other studies," and he recommended an extension of the woodworking program.[39]

Almost simultaneously with the announced success of the Dwight School manual training classes, the North End Industrial Home was recognizing the deficiencies of its educational projects. Although the Home tended to express satisfaction about its accomplishments, the North End's citizenry attended irregularly and the work of the charity agents, one writer suggested, was "regarded with little respect." Beginning to focus explicitly upon formal instruction rather than work production, the Home's sponsors were also seeking to regularize attendance while adding to the number of people participating. Acknowledging the role of philanthropy within the public school system, already exemplified by the Winthrop and Shurtleff Schools' sewing and the Dwight School's woodworking classes, the Industrial Home reversed procedures and brought public school pupils into a philanthropic environment. Receiving the support of Charles C. Perkins, chairman of the committee of the Boston School Board having jurisdiction over the public schools of the North End and at the same time, a member of the Advisory Board of the North End Home, the Industrial Home entered into an informal agreement in September 1883, with the Headmaster of the nearby Eliot Grammar School to release a small group of boys from the latter to the Home for two hours a week of woodworking instruction.[40]

---

[38] Boston, School Documents, 1881, #26, pp. 28-29; ibid., 1882, #15; ibid., #21, pp. 26-28; ibid., 1883, #22, pp. 37-39.

[39] Ibid., 1882, #15.

This ad hoc and limited arrangement soon proved unsatisfactory to the newly retitled North Bennet Street Industrial School, and in February, 1885, the School moved to open its manual training classes to a broader spectrum of public school pupils in the North End and surrounding areas. Unsure of its powers to expand the program, the committee with supervisory authority over the North End schools passed the request along to the Boston School Board's Committee on Manual Training. At a hearing of the latter, with the support of Superintendent of Schools Edwin Seaver and the headmasters of the Eliot, Hancock, and Winthrop schools, the latter two for girls, Mrs. Quincy Shaw offered to finance classes in printing, cooking, housekeeping, and laundrying for 150 girls,and printing, carpentry and shoemaking for an equivalent number of boys, provided they be released to attend the Industrial School during normal school hours. With the support of the headmasters involved, the Superintendent of Schools, the North End

---

[40] North Bennet Street, Annual Reports, 1881-87, pp. 5-6; DiLeo, "North Bennet Street," 5/24/63.

Division Committee of the School Board, the financial backing of the ubiquitous Mrs. Shaw, and the close association between the Industrial School and Boston's leading citizens, the Manual Training Committee's decision was a foregone conclusion. Cavalierly rejecting objections that the public school system should not transfer its pupils to private institutions during school hours, contending that the manual training instruction would remain under the supervision of public school authorities, and asserting that the program was regarded as an experiment, the Committee raised only one substantive question: "Can the School Committee legally send children of the public schools, in classes of 15, to the North Bennet Street Industrial School for the purpose of receiving industrial training during school hours?" When Boston's legal counsel responded that since manual training was not included in the state's required course of study, school children could not be compelled to attend classes, the Committee sanctioned the "released-time" arrangement providing parental consent was obtained for each child.[41]

The decision to formalize and expand the limited arrangement that had previously existed between the North Bennet Street School and the Eliot Grammar School effectively established the former as an essential participant in public education in Boston, and provided a base of stability and strength for the five year old philanthropic institution. More important, it transformed manual education from a charitable enterprise to a public school subject. "The connection of manual training with the work of the public school at once changed the estimation in which it was held by both parents and children, its recognition there giving it a dignity in their eyes, where it had before been regarded with little respect. The regular attendance of good numbers was at once secured, and the steady growth began. . . ." In addition, the new arrangement made explicit North

---

[41] Boston, School Documents, 1885, #3; DiLeo, "North Bennet Street," 5/24/63, 5/31/63.

Bennet Street's role as a proving ground for manual training. In its 1888 Annual Report, the Industrial School declared that it existed "primarily for the purpose of giving manual training to large numbers of pupils of varying ages, and it does this with the constant hope that by its work and experiments the day may be hastened when such training may be more fully incorporated into the Public School system of Boston."[42]

During the first two years after the experiment's approval, North Bennet Street conducted carpentry, shoemaking, printing, clay modeling, and cooking classes for between 800 and 900 public school pupils weekly from 11 North End and neighboring district schools, in addition to voluntary afternoon, evening, and Saturday classes for about 250. Between April 1887, and March 1888, more than 1000 public school children attended manual training classes each school week.[43]

Participating in the school instruction of 1000 children a week, Bennet Street continued to view itself as a private institution. "In answer to frequent inquiries, it must be often repeated, that although public school classes are sent here for manual training by permission of the school board, this school is a wholly private enterprise, and that, with the exception of the kindergarten, (the expense of which was last year assumed by the city) the school is wholly supported by private contributions." The School was, however, a private endeavor in the interests of public education, especially for particular kinds of children.

> It is believed that private experimental work in this field [manual training] will only make itself practically felt when it can point out good methods of dealing with large classes, without too great cost. . . . This school stands, here, a perpetual plea for the

---

[42] North Bennet Street, Annual Reports, 1881-87, p. 6; ibid., 1888, p. 3.

[43] Ibid., 1881-87, pp. 7-14; ibid., 1888, pp. 4-5; ibid., 1889, p. 17; Boston, School Documents, 1887, #22, p. 9.

> broader and more rational education of all our children. 'All of our children!' And yet, one is tempted to say a special word for those unlucky boys, with good perceptive powers, but whose strength 'lies not in the direction of memory.'

Pressing throughout the 1880's for an expansion of manual training instruction in the Boston public schools, North Bennet Street applauded the city's decision in 1892 to require hand learning in its education program. "This is a result to which the work of this school has always aimed, and it is hoped and believed that the opportunity furnished here for experimental work, for the study of methods and for observation of the effect of manual training upon hundreds of boys and girls, during the last 10 years, has helped effectively, to secure this public good. Something certainly has been done, in this school, toward educating public sentiment. . . ."[44]

The School Committee's decision did not terminate North Bennet Street's participation in Boston's public school system. "This building, with its thorough equipment," wrote the Industrial School's director in 1892, "is now meeting as genuine a need as ever, as the School Board, while it has made manual training compulsory, is not yet able to furnish a sufficient number of workshops for the needs of the whole city." Classes in woodworking and cooking, officially parts of the public school curriculum and now financed out of the school system's revenues, continued to be held at North Bennet Street. Indeed, manual training facilities in the North End public schools were totally inadequate throughout the 1890's, and 600 to 1000 school children annually attended North Bennet Street on a released-time basis for manual education classes now compulsory in the Boston system. As late as 1899, the Industrial School reported that it continued to provide the only specially equipped manual training rooms for public school children in the North End. Two years later, the situation remained virtually unchanged.[45]

---

[44] North Bennet Street, Annual Report, 1888, pp. 6-9; ibid., 1889, p. 3; ibid., 1889, p. 3; ibid., 1892, p. 3.

A system in which philanthropic and public responsibility were so closely related was bound to have its unharmonious moments. In the mid 1880's, for example, just as the formalized association occurred, teachers at North Bennet Street were warned to attain the educational standards of the public schools, a concern which continued in a variety of forms through the next decade. More important, the School's work faced continuing frustration and occasional hostility in its dealings with school masters and teachers in the districts from which it drew its children. In September, 1889, the School's director reported that school masters demanded that a whole grade level be taught simultaneously, refused to break up their classes, and thus caused severe overcrowding at North Bennet Street. Three months later, the director criticized the faculty of one public school for using "their influence in keeping the children away" from the manual training classes, a problem which also extended to the parents of the district. On another occasion the director criticized masters for withdrawing their pupils during the closing weeks of the school year. Similar problems arose over discipline, how it was to be administered and under whose authority.

> The subject of discipline at times becomes with us a perplexing one and not easily managed. Each master stamps his own individuality upon his school, controlling them after his own ideas so that a separate school has a distinct system of government. This is right, but it makes it a difficult matter for us, to adapt ourselves to all these different methods. This should be regulated by the school board, but probably will not be at present since we are not yet considered a

---

[45] Ibid., 1892, pp. 3-4; ibid., 1894, pp. 2-3; Boston, School Documents, 1894, #1, pp. 7-8; ibid., 1901, #4, p. 11. Attendance figures can be found in the North Bennet Street Annual Reports throughout the 1890's. After 1892, costs of instruction, save for heat and rent, appear to have been paid by the city.

> part of the school system. I spoke to Superintendent Seaver about it at one time, but he thought the matter would be better left alone. He said an attempt to settle it would bring about greater difficulties.[46]

Despite these frustrations, North Bennet Street continued to exalt in its peculiar relationship to the public schools. With the adoption of manual training by the Boston School Committee in 1892, the Industrial School's director wrote: "The two rooms which have been taken from us [and are now used as public school classrooms] seemed at first to narrow our borders and leave us with but meagre equipments for the battle against the ignorance and apathy of which we are in the midst. But there is no cause for mourning as their [the classrooms'] influence is still a power here with the weight of the School Board behind it to strengthen it in the minds of the doubting and the shortsighted." After the turn of the century, with the Boston public schools now providing basic manual instruction throughout its system, North Bennet Street increasingly began to emphasize social settlement goals in the North End. Summing up a quarter century's work, the School's 1905 Annual Report noted that, "In the course of its mission, the School, while retaining its industrial and educational features at their best, is developing more and more as a social settlement. As a result of such development, new needs have arisen, and among the hoped for extensions of the near future, are a roof garden, an improved gymnasium, shower baths, an attractive room for social purposes, and more resident apartments."[47]

---

[46] North Bennet Street, "Teachers of the North Bennet Street Industrial School" from A. W. Fiske, Secretary, Board of Managers [1885], ms. in files of School at Schlesinger Library; ibid., "Reports of the North Bennet Street Industrial School, 1888-96," 9/89, 12/5/89, 2/21/90, 5/2/90, 6/20/90, ms. in files; ibid., Annual Report, 1890, pp. 7-8.

[47] Ibid., "Reports, 1888-96," 2/3/93; ibid., Annual Report, 1905, p. 4; ibid., "Report of the Meetings of the Board of Managers," 2/17/05, ms. in files of Schlesinger Library.

By 1905, North Bennet Street had played a major role in establishing manual training in Boston's public schools. But if the School's Board of Managers in that year seemed to suggest a withdrawal of their association with the public system, it failed to recognize how dependent the city's educators had become upon philanthropic innovation. Through the sponsorship of prevocational classes, a placement bureau, the institution of more advanced sewing machine instruction, and programs directed at potential school dropouts, North Bennet Street remained an influential force in public education. In 1917, then the "only institution operating under private auspices which enjoys the privilege of cooperating with the Boston Public Schools," Superintendent of Schools Franklin B. Dyer declared, "such an institution. . . is invaluable in trying out the newer phases of education under such conditions as will determine their availability and general application." Put more succinctly, Assistant Superintendent of the Boston Schools Frank V. Thompson stated, "It is impossible for the public schools to carry on to any great extent educational experiments. The North Bennet Street Industrial School is the only institution of its kind which is doing this work. I regard it as a necessary supplement to the educational advancement of our young people in public schools."[48]

## VI

The success of the North Bennet Street Industrial School as a proving ground for manual education, the rhetoric which justified the experiments in hand learning there and elsewhere as essential to the restoration of previously accepted social values, were only the most striking aspects of manual training in late nineteenth century Massachusetts.

---

[48] Ibid., "Reports, 1888-96," 2/3/93; ibid., Annual Report, 1905, p. 4; ibid., Annual Report, 1909, pp. 50-54; ibid., 1910, pp. 14-24; ibid., 1915, pp. 3-7.

Part of a broadly based movement to restructure urban public education, to make the schools more relevant and meaningful by helping individuals cope with the changed relationships of their environment, manual training helped set the tone of change in the state's educational system. Based to a great extent on philanthropic enterprise, subsequently transferred to the public schools, manual training posed without fully resolving the complex question of a universal curriculum. While hand learning received support as a broadly conceived pedagogical reform and as a form of learning useful for all children, its roots in urban charity and the movements for juvenile delinquency and emancipated slave education suggested its application to those deemed deficient or deformed by society. Manual educators neither fully confronted nor resolved this confusion. Rather they diffused the tension existing between application to some or to all by incorporating philanthropy into the public schools, thereby broadening the definition of charity and removing the onus of poverty attached to it. In late nineteenth century Massachusetts urban schools, with so many children from the homes of immigrants, it became an accepted tenet that the goals of philanthropy and those of public education were almost synonymous. Not responsible for social problems themselves--unemployment, poverty--but with the values and deteriorating relationships those problems revealed, manual education turned the schools to a responsibility for social restoration without committing them to substantive social reform.

As the most obvious and most important innovation in the public school curriculum, manual training was not unchallenged. Oscillating between ambiguity, delaying actions--calls for more study and limited experimentation--articulate and frequently expressed opinions, and often a silent negativism toward implementing manual training proposals, the opponents of manual education rightly understood that the debates they were engaged in involved the goals and meaning of public education itself.

No Massachusetts schoolman articulated his opposition more consistently or more vociferously than did Albert P. Marble. Superintendent of the Worcester public schools for almost a quarter century before being ousted in 1894, President of the National Education Association in 1889, considered by the Journal of Education "without exception the keenest educational writer and talker in America," Marble was one of the nation's most respected educators. His approach to schooling blended strong conservatism with a mild willingness to implement changes. He urged teachers to use objects in their classrooms and emphasized spontaneous and imaginative teaching, but he also believed that pedagogy was becoming too material, that it too often depended upon what children could touch or see, and thus failed to respect abstraction and the intellect. While he supported kindergartens, he criticized systematic play, claiming that it repressed the spontaneity of childhood. Willing to acknowledge glaring defects in the public schools, he accepted educational innovation---the kindergarten, pedagogical reform, curriculum changes--only as a means to greater ends, "invaluable helps" in strengthening the goals of schooling. At issue in the manual training debates, Marble believed, was precisely this question of goals, for, he argued, among its advocates hand learning was becoming an end in itself.[49]

Marble's conclusions about American education drew upon the same assumptions as his opponents in the conflict over manual training. He accepted their vision of a harmonious and homogeneous past with institutions sharing responsibility for education and moral growth. With the breakdown of the rural community, changes in the nature and kinds of work available, and the deterioration of institutions, schools were now faced with novel and momentous burdens. Where Marble parted with many of his Massachusetts colleagues during the 1880's and 1890's was over the question of whether the public school should or could accept those responsibilities.[50]

---

[49] "The Worcester Situation," *Journal of Education*, 38: 10/26/93, 272; Albert P. Marble, *Discussions on Manual Training and on the Blair Bill, presented to the National Education Association*, 1888 (Boston, 1888), pp. 5-6, 10-12, 15, *passim*; Marble, *Presumption of Brains* (Boston, 1887?),pp. 5-6; Worcester, *School Report*, 1884, p. 45; "Albert P. Marble," *Boston Transcript*, 3/26/06, p. 3.

> There is a class of social reformers [he wrote in 1884] who look to the public schools for the cure of every evil that invests society--evils for which these schools are in no way responsible, and with which they are not specially fitted to cope. From the decay of the apprentice system consequent upon the rapid introduction of machinery in all kinds of work, and the resultant division and minute sub-division of labor, and from the difficulty of getting employment, which always existed, but which becomes more apparent when large numbers of people seek a livelihood in cities, instead of remaining self-employed and self-sustaining tillers of the soil --from these causes with which schools have nothing to do, our educational empiricists and our social reformers would lay upon the public schools the burden of a special preparation for one or more of the active industries of life....

Public education, he contended, was fragmenting under the demands of particularist groups who sought special consideration for their social problem.

> Numerous schemes for revolutionizing society and reforming the world, seek to attach themselves to the school system. Instead of leaving the schools to their legitimate work, many enthusiasts see, in the splendid equipment and the consistent system of the schools, a means and a powerful instrument to be seized upon for the furtherance of charitable work in the broad domain of sociology. Temperance, trades and religion, all have their advocates who wish to attach these issues, good in themselves, to the car of the common schools. The necessity for practicing economy is useful in keeping within reasonable limits such tendencies.

---

[50] Marble never explicitly confronted the corollary: whether other institutions could be reinvigorated to reassume their social responsibilities, although his arguments implicitly suggest they could.

School savings banks, for example, which had the laudable aim of encouraging habits of frugality threatened to turn the teacher into a "cashier." Temperance instruction, introduced under the unproven assumption that knowledge about alcohol would prevent drinking, opened the way for a host of other social amelioration schemes. "From the prevailing discussions within the last dozen years," Marble told a National Education Association audience in 1887, "one might be led to suppose that all social institutions were about to be merged, or ought to be merged, in the public schools; for no sooner is some evil of society displayed in unusual prominence, than some zealot, ambitious for distinction, proposes some new attachments to the school system."[51]

Having recognized that society had changed, and agreeing with many of his public school colleagues that the changes had disrupted the smooth integration of children into the larger society, Marble stressed the impossibility of schools acting as surrogates for other institutions even if they should desire it. "Education is something by far more comprehensive than schools. It is acquired not alone in schools; they aim at education, but they do not secure the whole of education, only a part of it." To a gathering of educators at a National Education Association meeting in 1880, he cautioned that "a child is in school only a part of the day. Great as the influence of the teacher may be, the home influence is greater. The street and society have a powerful influence upon young minds. These, the school can but partly resist. Other causes besides school must share largely in the credit or discredit of a community's morality." Two years later, he admonished parents for forgetting "that the duty of training the children morally, physically, industrially and to a considerable extent intellectually, still rests largely with them." The public schools, he concluded, "can not immediately bring on the millenium."[52]

---

[51] Marble, "The Unattainable in Public School Education," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1880, pp. 40-42; Worcester, School Report, 1884, p. 44; ibid., 1885, p. 21; Marble, Industrial Education as Part of the Common School Course: Address to the New England School Superintendent's Association, Boston, 5/29/85, p. 4; Marble, "Evening Schools," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1887, p. 186.

Moreover, Marble contended, fixing upon the school as an agent of immediate social reformation would undermine the one certain strength it possessed: its role in training the intellect.

> It is indeed quite possible [he wrote in 1884] that the social fabric may need some reconstruction with respect to the preparation which a child needs for active business, since the parents are usually so employed in stores, or mills or factories, that they have no opportunity to instruct their children. It is far more clear, however, that the public schools, as at present organized, cannot successfully accomplish what they may and ought in the direction of intellectual culture and a broad and general training useful in any business, and at the same time undertake with any reasonable hope of success to supply the place of the old apprenticeship system.

The quality of civilization, he argued, depended upon society's ability to engage in intelligent thought, and the school's contribution to that goal upon its function as an agent of mental stimulation. Too often, he wrote, contemporary attitudes toward education assumed that the brain was "non-existent or not to be disturbed."

> The incessant dealing with things, confining the attention to material objects, finding all truth, not in the ideal world of thought, but in the material world of machinery and tools--this is the very opposite of mental growth. That growth consists largely in the power to abstract the mind from the things of the sense, and to handle the thought when not clothed in matter. It is the very purpose of education in schools to give the pupils that power over their minds, which they already have over their bodies.[53]

---

[52] Marble, "School Supervision," Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1884-85, p. 225; ibid., "The Unattainable in Public School Education," pp. 35, 38, Worcester, School Report, 1882, pp. 31-35; Journal of Education, 12: 9/2/80, 163.

[53] Worcester, School Report, 1884, pp. 44-45; Marble, Presumption of Brains, pp. 8-9, 15; ibid., Discussions on Manual Training, p. 15.

Hostile to the transformation of the school into an agency for social change and emphasizing the limits of schooling in affecting social values, Marble directed his most withering attacks upon the advocates of manual training in the public schools. He rejected any valid association between hand learning and arguments for economic efficiency and the training of skilled workers, since both could be more effectively accomplished in special schools. Indeed, to meet the latter, he supported technical schools such as the Worcester Free Institute for Mechanics, and asserted that individuals seeking skills would establish their own educational institutions.

> The development of the Drawing Schools fully illustrates the method by which such separate elementary Industrial Schools as are here contemplated will spring into being when the time becomes ripe for them. Feeling the need of a better knowledge of draughting among workmen in shops of various kinds, the Worcester County Mechanics Association in this city organized schools for the apprentices, so called, who form a branch of that body. The experiment of conducting those schools, made by a class of men who knew what they wanted and could find a way to get it, demonstrated both the utility and the necessity for such schools.

Even more striking to Marble, as he surveyed the manual training movement, was the limited support it received among the working class. "The demand, so far," he wrote in 1884, "does not as a rule come from that class of people at all. It is heard mostly from theorists who anticipate a stratification of American society into classes similar to the older European communities." "The demand for manual training," he told a gathering of New England superintendents of schools a year later, "does not come from the people for whose children the training is designed; it comes chiefly from a class of self-constituted philanthropists who are intent upon providing for the 'masses' an education which shall fit them for their 'sphere'."[54]

---

[54] Worcester, School Report, 1884, pp. 45-47; ibid., 1885, pp. 50-52; Marble, Industrial Education, p. 3.

Marble also criticized the advocates of manual training for the limits of their commitment, the disparity between their rhetoric and their willingness to implement. The values attributed to manual education by its supporters, he wrote, hardly seemed likely to be inculcated by providing manual instruction one to two hours a week. The classes, moreover, were frequently taught in inadequate facilities: Boston's Dwight School woodworking course, for example, was in the basement of the school building. Although manual training was justified for its benefits to the poor and working class, Marble noted, the earliest experiments chose among the best students, those who seemed least likely to need hand learning. Class size often went beyond the limits declared feasible by manual education's advocates, while the argument that manual training provided an outlet for pupil interest, Marble considered no more relevant than student enthusiasm for hockey and roller skating.[55]

Marble's addresses and writings represented the most extensive attack on manual education offered by a Massachusetts educator. But the Worcester Superintendent also received the support of John Dickinson, Secretary of the State Board of Education between 1877 and 1893, who reiterated less consistently and considerably less forcefully the arguments offered by his colleague.[56]

Despite the insistence of men like Marble and Dickinson that manual training extended the public schools beyond their capacity and threatened to redefine the notion of a common education, by the late 1880's, opposition to hand learning had been placed on the defensive, its voices becoming increasingly strident. Individuals and groups once opposed or ambivalent about manual education, such as the State Board and the *Journal of Education,* had either ceased active opposition or become firm supporters.[57] At a National Education Association gathering in 1888, the question under discussion, "How, and to What Extent Can Manual Training be Engrafted in our System of Public Schools?," Marble noted, assumed that the issue had become how and how far rather than whether. That same year, in a symposium on manual training conducted by the *Journal of Education,* ten of the 13 Massachusetts superintendents of schools who responded to the question of whether there were any dangers in introducing the subject into the public schools declared either no or only slight danger. Only three, one of whom was Marble, refused to concede that manual training was an important intellectual activity.[58]

---

[55] Ibid., pp. 4-6; ibid., "Manual Training in Public Schools," Journal of Education, 27: 3/8/88, 147-78. As late as 1912, almost all elementary school cooking and manual training classes in Boston were given in basement rooms, often damp and poorly lit. Mary Crawford, "Basement School Rooms," Boston Common, 1/20/12, pp. 6-7.

[56] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1881-82, pp. 74-75; ibid., 1882-83, pp. 112-126; ibid., pp. 123-28; ibid., 1886-87, pp. 117, 119; John W. Dickinson, Principles and Methods of Teaching: Derived from a Knowledge of the Mind (Boston, 1898), pp. 9-10, 197-202.

By the mid 1890's, then, little ideological opposition to manual training existed in Massachusetts. Although a number of school systems had limited hand learning programs, the failing was usually for economic rather than ideological reasons. In 1894, Marble was ousted as Superintendent in Worcester, moving to a similar position in Omaha, Nebraska, and then to New York City, succeeded by a strong supporter of manual education.

---

[57] On the changing attitude of the *Journal of Education* toward manual training, see [New England] *Journal of Education,* 1: 4/3/75, 162; *ibid.,* 10: 11/20/79, 292; 13: 1/27/81, 62-63; 17: 6/7/83, 360-61; 26: 9/15/87, 152; 27: 3/8/88, 152; 28: 7/12/88, 65; 47: 2/10/98, 88. On the State Board of Education, see Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report,* 1881-82, pp. 11-12, 155-59; *ibid.,* 1882-83, p. 13; *ibid.,* 1883-84, pp. 16-17; *ibid.,* 1890-91, p. 12; *ibid.,* 1891-92, pp. 13-14.

[58] Marble, *Discussions on Manual Training,* pp. 3-4; *Journal of Education,* 27: 6/21/88, 388-89, 393.

John Dickinson was replaced as Secretary of the Board of Education by Frank A. Hill, another manual training advocate and former headmaster of Boston's Mechanic Arts School. In 1894, the state legislature required that all cities of 20,000 people provide manual training as part of their high school system; within a decade the requirement was extended to elementary schools. As the nineteenth century came to an end, A. E. Winship, editor-publisher of the influential Journal of Education, attested to the supremacy of manual education when he declared that manual training had been the "one great triumph of the New Education."[59]

---

[59] Winship in ibid., 47: 2/10/98, 88; "The Worcester Situation," ibid., 38: 10/26/93, 272. Data on the implementation of manual training programs during the 1890's can be found in the Annual Reports of the Massachusetts Board of Education for those years. See, e.g., 1893-94, pp. 69, 141-42, 439; 1894-95, pp. 372-85, 392-413; 1895-96, pp. 165-69, 442-51; and on implementation after manual training was required at all levels of a local school system, 1904-05, pp. 94-96. On manual education as an issue of financing rather than ideology, see Lowell, School Report, 1890, pp. 45-46; ibid., 1899, pp. 19-21; Fall River, Inaugural Address of the Mayor, 1899, p. 19. For Marble's replacement in Worcester, see Worcester, School Report, 1894, pp. 30-31. On Frank A. Hill as a strong advocate of manual training, see Manual Training Magazine, 1: 10/99, 53-54; ibid., 5: 1/04, 105-08.

# CHAPTER V

# FROM THE PRINCIPLES OF WORK TO THE TEACHING OF TRADES

## I

By the turn of the century, manual education had achieved an ideological consensus among Massachusetts' educators. Pedagogically sound, a creative synthesis of physical activity, pupil desires, and socialization, it seemed an effective way of inculcating social values without hindering, and indeed even enhancing, academic learning. Most welcomed technological change, believed that little alternative to the city existed, and hoped manual training would correct the deleterious social conditions which industrialization and urbanization produced. Although they differed over the extent to which such instruction should be given, few rejected the argument that the dexterity acquired in such classroom activities as sewing and woodworking would offset those conditions, particularly among children from or destined to enter -- the two categories were usually assumed synonymous -- the ranks of manual labor. The ideology of manual training thus placed the public school at the center of social reconstitution, the key agency in a society whose values were being threatened by the dysfunctional workings of its institutions. Concerned, moreover, about the foreignization of society, the stream of non-English speaking peoples now enlarged to flood proportions, philanthropists and the educators who supported them turned from private benefaction to more systematic and institutionalized programs under public auspices. Manual activities in the public school classroom -- the reintegration of the head and the hand and instruction in the principles and values of work -- offered hope for social restoration, a means of achieving social stability.

Precisely at this point, however, when manual education as a mechanism for dealing with social values had become a prominent and apparently accepted feature of Massachusetts' educational ideology, it was undergoing a seemingly endless barrage of criticism, most strikingly from those the movement had once called its staunchest friends. In part, criticism emerged from those who complained of the inadequate instruction being offered. In New Bedford, for example, the Superintendent of Schools complained in 1905 that state legislation requiring manual education in the city's high school had been "persistently ignored" for a decade. Despite plans for a new high school building, the Superintendent discerned little movement toward incorporating hand learning into the secondary school curriculum. Of the twenty-seven cities and towns in Massachusetts in 1904-05 with populations of at least 20,000, five offered no manual training in their grammar schools, only one gave instruction for more than two hours a week, and most offered it for an hour or less. In the same municipalities, despite the presence of some manual training high schools and special manual education courses, manual instruction seemed equally inadequate. Nine of the twenty-seven cities and towns offered no high school manual education, six gave less than five hours per week, and the remainder between five and ten hours, though one or two may have offered slightly more than ten. Even the most committed advocates of hand learning could hardly state with assurance that social values would be inculcated through such limited contact.[1]

---

[1] These figures undoubtedly overstate the amount of manual training being given, since they were responses by superintendents of schools designed to show compliance with state legislation requiring such instruction. Nor do the figures reveal the extent of commitment to manual education, whether new equipment, sufficient supplies, or special teachers were provided beyond scheduling a few hours a week. In municipalities of less than 20,000 people, manual training instruction was even less frequently given. Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1904-05, pp. 96-103, 293; New Bedford, Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1905, pp. 137-38. See also Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1894-95, pp. 365-414; Lynn, School Report, 1901, p. 36; Thomas Balliet, "The Organization of Trade Schools," Manual Training Maga-

Some early supporters continued to press solely for more and better instruction. They criticized the false economy of inadequate implementation, or they condemned the undue emphasis being given to academic learning, the disjunction between the professed acceptance of manual training and its implementation. Such arguments represented the alignments previously established. They affirmed manual education's broad philanthropic goals. After 1900, however, criticism addressed itself less to more and better manual training than to new forms of hand learning. Rejecting the social reconstitution goals of manual education, the critics, most often manual training's former advocates, called for commitments to trade training, job placement, and industrial efficiency, themes previously muted and subordinate. That transition from the principles of work to the learning of trades would effect a fundamental revision in educational ideology, significantly altering the shape and assumptions of public schooling in twentieth century Massachusetts.

This shift in goals after 1900 among manual training's former enthusiasts was pervasive, but a particularly relevant example was Frank M. Leavitt. Before becoming one of Boston's first manual training teachers in 1889, Leavitt had worked in a mercantile house, an electric factory, and had studied at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and the Sloyd Normal School of Gustaf Larsson. In the 1890's, he was appointed principal of the various manual training classes in Boston, then elevated to assistant director of drawing and manual training, where he became responsible for organizing and developing

---

zine, 5:10/03, 1-5; Gladys Midura, "A Critical History of Public Secondary Education in Springfield, Massachusetts," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1961, p. 240. See also Edward A. Krug, The Shaping of the American High School (New York, 1964), p. 218. [Hereafter reports of school committees and superintendents of schools will be cited as School Report.]

manual education in the public schools. Simultaneously, his service on the executive committee of the Children's Mission attested to the continuing ties which linked philanthropy and hand learning. In 1906, Leavitt achieved national prominence among the country's educators when he became president of the manual training department of the National Education Association, and two years later president of the Eastern Manual Teachers Association.[2]

Leavitt was thus a preeminent spokesman for manual education. The most important practitioner of hand learning instruction within Boston's educational establishment, which, in turn, had shaped the manual education movement in Massachusetts, he defended manual training's implementation and sought its expansion whenever possible. Like his associates in the movement, Leavitt argued that modern society required the school to meet the demands of social stability and social progress.

> It is not to be doubted that we are in the midst of a complex and gigantic movement, somewhat indefinite and indistinct as to its direction and its ultimate results, but certainly involving great social and industrial change and promising universal betterment.... There is probably no single agency which has had so many demands made upon it to help in the solution of the problems which this great movement is presenting as has the public school, and the response which it has made to the demands should be a matter of pride to those who believe in the great mission of this most important of democratic institutions.

Before 1900, individuals like Leavitt had justified manual training as a means of stabilizing the chaos of industrial and urban change, preserving social values and restoring order to a society threatened by the centrifugal pressures of modern life. By the first decade of the twentieth century, however, Leavitt had begun to question these social ameliorative goals. Whereas hand learning had once been thought necessary for all children, with special applicability to the poor and deviant, industrial education -- here referring to manual training related to industrial processes -- "frankly recognizes that all cannot have and do not need the same education."

---

[2] Manual Training Magazine, 9:6/08, v. Leavitt later became a Professor of Industrial Education at the University of Chicago.

> It means a thorough revision of our school system with the purpose of furnishing for the working classes an education which bears somewhat the same relation to their prospective life work as does the college education to the future work of the professional and managerial classes....It means, in the final analysis, the fitting of a particular boy for a particular job, and it is therefore strongly individualistic.

Indeed, Leavitt argued, justifying manual education for its social value may have been politically necessary to gain widespread support, and thus had helped it enter the schools, but it undermined manual training's essential contribution to an industrial society. Hand learning's advocates, Leavitt declared, had too readily rationalized their proposals as cultural contributions, had too frequently fixed upon the social goals of constructive work. They had accepted a psychology of learning which emphasized the interrelationship of the mind and the hand, the physical and the intellectual, rather than distinguishing categories of learning. "The result of this discussion," Leavitt wrote, "was to establish the claim that manual training had a distinct cultural value...."

This process, however, had worked to manual education's long term detriment. Justified as a cultural rather than industrial need, hand learning had been instituted without reference to the demands of modern industry, and thus had been severed from real life as completely as the school subjects it was designed to replace.

> The fact is, that educational authorities very early set up

> scholastic requirements for the teachers of the new subjects. Before a man could teach machine-shop work in a high school he had to pass an examination in English and American literature, algebra, demonstrative geometry, a foreign language, etc. etc. The result was that in time the work fell into the hands of men who were trained in the traditional school subjects rather than in the practical work which they were to teach.

In sum, Leavitt concluded, manual training's original impetus as an aid to industrial growth had failed to be implemented, undercut by a myopic concern for social reformation and an ossifying commitment to academic respectability.[3]

Such arguments, the attempt to turn manual education toward industrial training and vocational placement, had appeared before 1900. The manufacturers who had proposed industrial art education, while considerably less articulate, placed industrial efficiency and job opportunity at the center of their proposals. Similarly, the North Bennet Street Industrial School reported in 1889 that it was under heavy pressure to teach trades rather than continuing to emphasize manual training's broad educational goals. Nevertheless, prior to 1900 the ideology of manual education, as North Bennet Street's director noted, centered upon a commitment to social restoration and intellectual stimulation. Leavitt's complaint that manual educators had adopted oblique rationalizations to overcome opposition failed to account for the faith those same educators actually placed in their rationales. Manual training, they believed, did train the head through the hand. Cooking classes were not designed to create cooks, but taught domestic economy and the elements of science -- chemistry, botany, physiology, anatomy, and physics. All manual education courses sought to inculcate the principles and values of work. They did not and should not teach specific work functions. "Where properly incorporated into the curriculum," wrote Charles F. Carroll, the strong manual education enthusiast who had replaced A.P. Marble as Superintendent of the Worcester schools in the mid-1890's, "manual training would harmonize class feelings being engendered by work distinctions in the industrial society." "Many a wealthy parent would be glad to have his boy take such a course of hand work...and every boy's opportunity in life would be indefinitely advanced by such...training...."[4]

---

[3] Frank M. Leavitt, Examples of Industrial Education (Boston, 1912), pp. iii, 2, 6, 11-13, 17-19, 59; Leavitt, "Industrial Education in the Elementary Schools," Manual Training Magazine, 9:6/08, 379-80.

Leavitt's argument that manual activities had entered the schools because they focused on social values was thus correct. By suggesting, however, that manual educators adopted the ideology of social restoration as a temporary expedient advanced until industrial and vocational goals could be asserted, Leavitt had misinterpreted the roots of the manual training movement. Yet his conclusions about manual education received widespread support in the first decades of the twentieth century. His attack on manual training as a misguided exercise in cultural resuscitation became representative of Massachusetts' educational thought. Leavitt's commitment to an ideology which spoke less of restoring social values than of upholding and implementing current values, an ideology which called upon the school to adapt itself to and support the industrial economy in which it functioned, and to prepare its students for particular roles in that economy became the distinctive concern of the industrial education movement. This development derived from a number of sources, but none more important than the growing concern after 1900 with the problem of the dropout.

---

[4] North Bennet Street Industrial School, Annual Report of the Director, 1889, pp. 10-15. (All references to the North Bennet Street School can be found in the School's Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College); C.F. Carroll quoted in Isaac E. Clarke, Art and Industry (U.S. Senate, Executive Documents, 1897), 46th Congress, 2nd session, vol. 7, part 3, p. 1095. On the manufacturers' plea for industrial drawing, see above, pp. 121-26.

## II

Throughout the nineteenth century, public education in Massachusetts had been involved in a frenetic quest for institutional security. In hopes of achieving broad community support, the state's educators propagandized and modified their ideology and policies, and sought to raise the public school to a position of social necessity. Compulsory attendance legislation had been integral to these concerns, in its extension and enforcement both reflecting and stimulating community acceptance of the school. How far, asked John Dickinson, Secretary of the State Board of Education in 1874, may the State "compel the attendance of its children upon its schools? If it has a right to punish idleness and crime, may it not prevent these by guarding against them?...The State is a party to the relation which a parent holds to his children, and he has no more right to rob those children of what they need to perform their duties as good citizens, than he has to steal from the public treasury." Refusal to comply with such legislation -- the act of truancy -- by either parent or child thus represented not simply an individual decision, but a grave threat to the school as a social institution and the viability of public education itself. "Are the children of school age at school?" as Lawrence's Superintendent of Schools phrased it in 1878, was the fundamental educational question of the century to which all other issues were secondary.[5]

---

[5] Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Eighth Annual Report, [1873-74], p. 215; Lawrence, School Report, 1878, p. 10; John Dickinson, "Compulsory School Attendance," Journal of Education, 18: 6/28/83, pp. 6-7; John W. Perrin, The History of Compulsory Education in New England (Meadville, 1896), pp. 57-62. See also the comments of the Lynn School Committee in Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Sixth Annual Report, [1871-72], "Abstracts," pp. 81-82; George Walton, "Report by the State Board of Education on School Attendance and Truancy in Massachusetts," ibid., 1894-95, pp. 527-601.

Through the 1870's and 1880's, the answer to that question remained unsatisfactory. "The States," Secretary of the Board of Education Joseph White contended in 1871, indirectly referring to Massachusetts, "cannot afford to let 20 or 25% of their children obtain their education in the streets or at the corner groceries and railroad stations, and in our manufacturing establishments." When the proportion of school age children not attending school was only moderately reduced a decade later, the Board's Secretary warned that the number was "much too large for either the safety or the prosperity of the State," and he called for a more vigorous commitment to the enforcement of the compulsory education statutes.[6]

By the turn of the century however, truancy had become a considerably less significant issue. Despite some inconsistencies, attendance laws were being enforced or, more accurately, were being accepted in most parts of the state. Statutes had increased the age at which children could work in factories and mercantile establishments to fourteen, coinciding with an apparent decline in industry's demand for child labor. While still a problem, particularly in the state's rural areas, truancy in practice represented more a nuisance than a fundamental threat to public education. Even a comprehensive survey of school attendance by the State Board of Education in 1894-95, undertaken to elicit support for more efficient enforcement of truancy regulations, admitted that average attendance in the state's public schools equalled 92% of enrollment, and the proportion was even higher -- between 95% and 98% -- in the largest cities. As the twentieth century opened, truancy had thus become a subordinate issue in the hierarchy of Massachusetts' urban educational problems.[7]

---

[6] White's comment is in American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings and Addresses, 1871, p. 19, but see also pp. 18-35; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1880-81, p. 75; Lynn, School Report, 1889, pp. 55-56.

High levels of attendance for children under fourteen, the minimum age of compulsory education, while satisfying, nonetheless exposed the severity of a number of related and complex issues, particularly those involving the problem of the dropout. If schooling was as beneficial to the individual and society, a conclusion the acceptance of compulsory attendance seemed to indicate, why did so many children leave school at fourteen and fifteen, the earliest possible legal moment? Why did children move so slowly through school, many reaching the limits of compulsory education without reaching the upper grades of grammar school? Why did less than 10% of the state's school children attend high school? Were the schools failing to communicate their advantages or were the state's children incapable of comprehending them? At the beginning of the twentieth century, none of these questions were entirely novel, but they had never been raised as explicitly nor with such urgency. They were questions which forced Massachusetts' educators into a basic re-evaluation of their assumptions and goals, a re-analysis which became embodied in the movement for industrial-vocational schooling.[8]

---

[7] Walton, "Report...on School Attendance and Truancy," p. 529; Boston, Documents of the School Committee, 1897, #5, pp. 67-68. (Hereafter cited as Boston, School Documents.)

[8] The manual training movement had raised some of these questions when it asserted that hand learning would keep children in school longer because of its inherent interest to the child and the training for manual labor it provided. See, e.g., the statement of G.T. Fletcher in American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1884, p. 209 and Frank W. Ballou, "The Present Status of Manual Training in the Public Schools of the United States," Manual Training Magazine, 9:10/07, 21-22.

A host of complex and interrelated issues, the problem of the dropout began with the question of attrition, the withdrawal of children from school as they progressed through the various grade levels. Despite growth in the proportion of pupils graduating from grammar school and entering high school in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, the number that failed to do so remained higher than most Massachusetts educators willingly accepted. Estimates varied, but a study in 1897 by the State Board of Education found 6.7% of the school enrollment in the state's ten largest cities attending high school, with a high of 10.3% in Worcester and a low of 4.4% in the immigrant-industrial city of Fall River. Fourteen years later, a Boston Finance Commission survey estimated that 9.6% of the school enrollment in seven of the state's largest cities were in high school, with Springfield topping the list at 11.3% and Fall River again low at 5.5%. The trend was thus upward, but with only a slowly increasing percentage of students reaching secondary school levels. Equally disturbing was the large number of children who never seemed to get out of the primary grades. Superintendents of schools in Massachusetts' cities frequently reported between 40% and 50% of their total school enrollment in the first three or four grades as compared to the six grammar and four high school classes. Again, while the situation improved after the turn of the century, it was not dramatically altered.[9]

---

[9] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1896-97, pp. 100-02; Finance Commission of the City of Boston, Report on the Boston School System (Boston, 1911), p. 166. The comparison of primary to grammar and high school enrollment is based on data compiled from theannual school reports of Boston, Haverhill, Fall River, Lawrence, Lowell, and Worcester between 1889 and 1910 and from material on Massachusetts cities in United States Immigration Commission, "The Children of Immigrants in the Schools," Reports, vols. 29-33 (Washington, D.C., 1911). As late as 1913, 65% of New Bedford's eight year public elementary school pupils were enrolled in the first four grades. New Bedford, School Report, 1913, p. 42.

The small proportion of children in grammar and high school as a percentage of total enrollments could have been produced by a constantly growing birth rate. But to Massachusetts' educators, it more realistically suggested that their goal of full community schooling was being inadequately fulfilled. Confirmation of this view occurred when the educators began to compile attrition statistics. Considerably more difficult to ascertain and undoubtedly less accurate when presented than the simple quantification of enrollment -- almost no way exists, for example, to determine whether the removal of a child from school meant permanent withdrawal or simply transfer to another school -- the enumeration of rates of attrition nevertheless received considerable attention, and the estimates offered provide significant insight into the scope of the problems the state's educators faced.

Attempting to assess progress through school, the State Board of Education conservatively estimated in 1898 that 75% of all public school pupils failed to enter high school, and that more than one half did not reach the last year of grammar school. The following year, a study of Cambridge and Somerville revealed that of those who began school, 47% in Cambridge and 36% in Somerville failed to reach even the fifth grade. The situation, as the figures on high school enrollment have already suggested, was considerably worse in Fall River, undoubtedly the city with the poorest provisions for schooling in Massachusetts. An 1892 survey there found 60% of the student body not going beyond the third grade and 80% leaving before the sixth grade. One of the more comprehensive studies of attrition undertaken in Boston in 1905 probably summarized conditions in the more successful urban school systems. Attempting to trace the annual decline in class size beginning with an entering primary school class in 1892, the city found that 61% of those who began school in that year finished the fifth grade, 32% graduated from grammar school, and 21.5% entered high school. Again, while these aggregate figures are by no means conclusive -- they totally ignore movement in and out of the schools -- they reveal that the overwhelming number of pupils in Massachusetts' cities never reached high school, and more important, that the majority left school before having completed the requirements for a grammar school degree.[10]

Closely related to attrition rates was the problem of overage children, commonly referred to after 1910 as retardation. Before 1900, concern for children considerably older than their classmates had centered almost exclusively in Boston's Superintendent of Schools, Edwin P. Seaver. Throughout the 1880's and 1890's, Seaver waged a virtual one-man campaign to eliminate or at least alleviate a situation he deemed detrimental to the morals of young children and disruptive of the smooth functioning of his school system. "The presence of pupils, especially boys," he wrote in 1887, "who are eleven, twelve, and thirteen years old in primary schools ought not, it seems to me, to be tolerated any longer." Five years earlier, Seaver had reported that more than one-half the fourteen year olds in Boston's public schools were in the seventh grade or lower when they should have been enrolled in the ninth grade.

---

[10] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1897-98, p. 18; ibid., 1898-99, pp. 111-18; Fall River, School Report, 1892, pp. 19-20; Boston, School Documents, 1905, #11, chart opposite p. 27.

Although the school system was so structured that nine year olds should have entered grammar school (their fourth year of schooling beyond the kindergarten), more than one-fifth of Boston's primary pupils were already nine or above.[11]

In part, Seaver argued, the problem was one of entry. Parents often neglected to enroll their children for a year or two beyond the regular starting age of six. More significant, however, were the delays encountered as children progressed through school. In the early 1880's, the Superintendent found almost 40% of the city's grammar school graduates had taken more than six years to complete what was nominally a six year course. Delays such as these and similar ones in the primary grades might be accounted for by personal and environmental deficiencies, particularly if they could be related to the immigrant and the poor, but Seaver found the problem prevalent throughout the city, and he thus focused on structural defects, inadequacies in the efficient administration of the school system. After carefully sorting out the presence of overage pupils by grammar schools, he concluded in 1882, "it will be admitted as a general rule that the presence of comparatively large numbers of old pupils in the lower grades indicates inefficient teaching, or deficient management, or both. In other words, the more judicious and efficient the management of the school the more nearly will the pupils be found in the classes corresponding to their ages, and at the same time properly qualified to be there."[12]

---

[11] Boston, School Documents, 1887, #3, pp. 5-6; ibid., 1882 #4, pp. 24-26. On the use of the term "retardation," see below Chapter 7, footnote 5.

Seaver's argument that the cure for the problem of overage children, and by extension the problem of the dropout, lay in revising the modus operandi of the public schools -- through standardized tests and grading procedures, uniform promotion requirements, closer supervision of teaching standards, the establishment of special ungraded classes for the overaged, and a strengthened centralized bureaucracy to assure all of this -- reinforced similar arguments by the late nineteenth century advocates of manual training. The latter had contended that the introduction of hand learning would make schooling more attractive and more useful, and would thus lead to more regular and longer attendance. Yet, as we have seen, the turn of the century had not brought a significant alteration in either the overage or dropout patterns, even where hand learning had been implemented. Large numbers of children continued to advance through school at slow rates and to drop out as soon as possible. In the first decade of the twentieth century Massachusetts' educators directed their energies toward a resolution of these problems, and in the process evolved an ethos for industrial schooling.

## III

Concern over the high rates of attrition, irregular progress through school, and the problem of overage children represented the crucial backdrop to the industrial education movement. Wherever they looked -- in the best and worst of urban school sytems -- Massachusetts' educators found large numbers of children leaving school at the ages of fourteen and fifteen, with little regard to the grade levels they had reached.

---

[12] Boston, School Documents, 1882, #4, pp. 22-39; ibid., 1887, #3, pp. 5-6 ibid., 1890, #7, pp. 39-51; ibid., 1892, #12, pp. 8-10, 17-26, 69-171; ibid., 1895, #4, pp. 11-35.

Why? Where did they go? What happened to them? What relationship did schooling have to their lives? These were the significant questions posed by the dropout problem, and in 1905-1906, a young sociologist attempted to provide Massachusetts' educators with some of the answers.

A by-product of the report of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Susan Kingsbury's study of "The Relation of Children to the industries [of Massachusetts]" laid the sociological basis for many of the decisions the state's educators would make for the next decade. Considered by the Commission "the most thorough inquiry into the relations of children to the industries of the community which has yet been made in this country," Kingsbury and her staff of five young women "who were especially fitted to gain the confidence of the parent and to portray the points of vital importance with regard to conditions, attitudes of mind and financial status of the family" conducted their investigations in 43 Massachusetts cities and towns throughout the state, in 354 industrial establishments representing 55 industries, and including 5,459 children from 3,157 homes. Their primary concern, however, lay in the condition and fate of the estimated 25,000 children ages fourteen to sixteen in Massachusetts -- five-sixths of whom had failed to complete grammar school, one-half not going beyond the seventh grade, and one-quarter receiving less than a sixth grade education -- who were either at work or idle. Children for whom the time between fourteen and sixteen, Kingsbury began her report, had come to be considered "the wasted years."

> The State releases the child from its educational authority at fourteen, and the child who is no longer interested in the inactive school life, or who feels the stress of necessity for self-support, is forced to search for an opportunity to fit himself for industrial responsibilities. What awaits him?

> No schools exist which offer practical training until he is at least sixteen or eighteen, and even then they are few in number and usually at a great distance from the child's home. He must turn to the 'practical school of life' and seek employment, only to find that the doors of those industries which would afford him an opportunity 'to pick up a trade' are not open to him until he is sixteen, or usually eighteen years of age, while very few of the so-called apprentice-ships receive him under eighteen. Even in the unskilled industries of the better class, proprietors are becoming more and more averse to the employment of the younger child. The result is that he drifts into an unskilled industry, or into one which is undesirable in character.[13]

Although Kingsbury followed these introductory remarks by rhetorically asking "Are these years wasted?" she had already established the tone and suggested the conclusions of her report. Free from legal compulsion, children left school at fourteen out of "necessity for self-support" or dulled by the "inactive school life," the latter, Kingsbury argued, considerably more influential than the former. Massachusetts' economy forced the school dropout into seeking industrial employment where learning was unsystematic and where jobs in "industries of the better class" -- clean, better paying, non-immigrant, and with opportunities for advancement -- were becoming scarce for those under eighteen. "Our investigations have shown... that the grades of industry entered by the child between fourteen and sixteen are of the lowest order." Unprepared for the "practical school of life," these children took undesirable and unskilled positions, their economic mobility limited, their prospects for future success dim.[14]

---

[13] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report (Boston, 1906), pp. 2-3; "Report of the Sub-Committee on the Relation of Children to the Industries," ibid., pp. 25-31. Personal interviews by Kingsbury's staff were actually conducted in sixteen of the forty-three municipalities reported on. See also Krug, Shaping of the American High School, pp. 221-222. On Susan M. Kingsbury, see Women's Who's Who of America, 1914-15, edited by J.W. Leonard (New York, 1914) p. 459.

Having established her thesis, Kingsbury recognized variations, though she consistently subordinated their significance to the general argument. Job opportunities, for example, were closely related to local industry and thus varied in different cities and parts of the state. Communities with a high proportion of skilled occupations not employing juvenile labor had a lower proportion of school dropouts than other areas. Commercial centers similarly kept their children in school longer than the textile mill cities. While 68% of all fourteen to sixteen year olds who began work entered unskilled industries with little opportunity for advancement, 12% of the total worked in skilled industries, although most held unskilled jobs. The dropout and "dead end job situation was worst in the textile centers. In North Adams and Lowell, about one half the fourteen to sixteen year olds were at work, 70% to 80% in the mills or related unskilled occupations. In New Bedford and Fall River, the proportions were even higher, with almost all working children in the cotton textile factories. As a group, these towns exemplified the worst characteristics of the "wasted years."[15]

Although the under sixteen child entered the textile mills at relatively high wages -- between $3.50 and $4.00 a week -- within two to four years he reached a plateau of $6.00 to $8.00 and occasionally $10.00 a week. In contrast, children who delayed entry until sixteen rapidly attained a similar level, usually within two years. In both cases, however, children who entered textile mills remained mired in them with little opportunity "up" and little way "out," other than moving between mills or being laid off. Potentially worse, and here as in other parts of the report Kingsbury distinguished between the needs of the working class child and those of the immigrant, unskilled textile labor was "passing gradually to poorer and poorer classes of foreigners," and thus seemed certain to become even less remunerative and more of a dead end for Massachusetts' youth. The "wasted years" syndrome for children who left school at fourteen or fifteen to enter the textile mills, Kingsbury found, rarely varied: relatively good wages upon entry becoming minimal within four years, with mill work experience providing little in the way of transferable skills or opportunities for economic mobility.[16]

---

[14] "Relation of Children to the Industries," pp. 32-34.

[15] Ibid., pp. 35, 39, 43, 85, 87-89.

In the state's four largest commercial centers -- Boston, Worcester, Springfield and Cambridge -- Kingsbury found a less depressing and more confused situation. The department store "cash and bundle" girls, errand and messenger service boys, confectionary factory workers, and youth engaged in other light goods production were considerably more difficult to generalize about than the textile workers. While poorly paid and rarely seeming to advance, the white collar department store girls, for example, stood in sharp contrast to the immigrant and lower class candy factory labor. Yet despite the heterogeneity of available employment in the commercial cities, Kingsbury's conclusions paralleled her assessment of the textile industries: minimal wages with little possibility of advancement. Although department store girls and errand boys sometimes moved up in the job hierarchy, such occasions occurred haphazardly and infrequently. The best that Kingsbury could say for the opportunities for unskilled fourteen to sixteen year olds in the commercial centers was that some children appeared able to move into other employment as they got older, a condition not apparent in the textile centers. But the haphazard nature of these changes confirmed her belief that the years before sixteen were wasted.[17]

---

[16] "Relation of Children to the Industries," pp. 35-47. While Kingsbury differentiated between the cotton mills and the somewhat better conditions in the woolen mills -- a less immigrant work force and cleaner, though not higher paying work -- her overall assessment of the textile industries was hardly touched by the distinctions. The other textile industry in the state, silk, was in somewhat the same condition as wool, but it hired so few young employees that the report took little notice of it.

That employment for children ages fourteen to sixteen was almost valueless seemed clear. That the low wages, poor working environment, and low quality personnel also exposed youth to immoral temptations and practices seemed equally apparent. As important, Kingsbury argued, there were alternatives; one could ask "What these years might have meant if they could have been spent in desirable occupations or in school." For one, and in many ways this was the most controversial finding of the investigation, most families could afford to keep their children in school. The $2.00 to $4.00 a week fourteen and fifteen year olds earned, in practice, amounted to less than $1.50 when working expenses and loss due to idle periods were accounted for. The vast majority of working class families interviewed by Kingsbury's staff -- very few poor immigrant families were included in the survey-- could easily survive without the child's income, particularly if postponement brought economic benefits in the future.. Most children, "except for the lower foreign element," left school, Kingsbury wrote, of their own volition: "It is dissatisfaction on the part of the child which takes him from school...." "Read with the visitor history after history of the child and of the family, and you will find that the child left school from choice, and that the parents objected."[18]

---

[17] "Relation of Children to the Industries," pp. 47-54. Kingsbury also briefly surveyed Brockton and Lynn, the state's most important shoe manufacturing cities, and the jewelry center of Attleborough. In the two industries represented, however, she found few children employed under sixteen, although she suggested that the years fourteen to sixteen could be profitably spent systematically preparing for the trades. Ibid., pp. 55-56.

The consequences of that choice, already enumerated, led Kingsbury to suggest more interesting curricula and more obvious and more immediately economically beneficial schooling. Ending boredom by providing an active school program, earlier proposed by manual educators, combined with the teaching of industrial skills -- "practical training in specific industries" -- aimed at the fourteen through sixteen year old, Kingsbury concluded, were the necessary preconditions for the elimination of the "wasted years" and the placing of Massachusetts' youth out of "deadend" jobs.[19]

Seemingly scientifically arrived at -- Kingsbury had just received a doctoral degree in sociology from Columbia University -- including a large sample, and forcefully argued, Kingsbury's conclusions were to exert wide influence within and beyond Massachusetts. Yet her commitment to the notion that schooling enhanced occupational mobility led her to overlook the ambiguities of her data. In some cases, for example, age of job entry appeared more important than level of grade school attainment. Family background -- a father or relative already in the trade -- similarly appeared to open some semi-skilled and skilled job opportunities more readily than continued schooling. While Kingsbury admitted that occupational comparisons between technical school and mechanic arts high school graduates on the one side and grammar school dropouts on the other were invalid, she nonetheless presented them to justify trade school training. Moreover, her conclusions on the economic well-being of the working class could depend on a weekly income of as little as $3.00 per family member. Additionallly, the report consistently sought to differentiate Massachusetts' working class from the "shiftless and unambitious" poor, most of whom were immigrants. Its recommendations thus neglected a crucial element of the dropout problem particularly in the state's industrial cities. The tragedy of youth in the cotton mills, Kingsbury wrote, was not simply economic, but the association of children "with our most undesirable population." Despite the ambiguities, however, despite the neglect of and the bias against the immigrant poor, and to a lesser extent against trade unions, Kingsbury's argument that industrial schooling would resolve the dropout problem and foster occupational mobility became the sociological basis of Massachusetts' movement toward vocational education.[20]

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 44, 48-54, 57-69, 86-87.

[19] Ibid., pp. 45-46, 64-93. Kingsbury adopted what was becoming a maxim of American education: continued schooling led to more intelligent workers who produced higher quality goods, and on that basis could demand higher wages.

---

[20] Ibid., pp. 27n, 35, 38-43, 45, 57-58, 64-69, 81-84, 90-93. Kingsbury's findings that 75% of Massachusetts' children who left school could have been supported by their families during a period of extended schooling received both confirmation and criticism after 1906. A U.S. Department of Labor survey of school learning in Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, Georgia, South Carolina, and Alabama and a study of 800 Iowa boys placed the percentages economically able to remain in school at 60% and 67% respectively, lower than Kingsbury's estimates but still considerably above a majority. That Kingsbury's research did not include a substantial portion of poor immigrant families was suggested by intensive studies, critical of Kingsbury's methodology, of the Chicago stockyards undertaken somewhat after the Massachusetts survey, which found that less than a majority could afford to dispense with the earnings of their fourteen to sixteen year old children. U.S. Department of Commerce and Labor, Conditions Under Which Children Leave School to Go to Work, Report on Condition of Women and Child Wage Earners in the United States (Washington, D.C., 1910), VII 104-05, 123-24; Ervin E. Lewis, "Work, Wages, and Schooling of 800 Iowa Boys in Relation to Problems of Vocational Guidance," in Meyer Bloomfield, Readings in Vocational Guidance (Boston, 1915), pp. 237-40; Ernest L. Talbert, "Opportunities in School and Industry for Children of the [Chicago] Stockyards District," ibid., pp. 397, 430-32; Louise Montgomery, "The American Girl in the Stockyards District," ibid., pp. 471-72; Sophonisba P. Breckinridge and Edith Abbott, "The School and the Working-Child," ibid., pp. 486-87.

## IV

"The Relations of Children to the Industries" gained much of its prominence from its publication as a supplement to the report of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, almost universally known as the Douglas Commission. William Douglas had come to the governor's mansion in 1905 as the only Democrat to win statewide office in the 1904 elections, compiling the largest popular vote in almost a decade. A self-made man, owner of the largest shoe factory in Brockton, the new governor was also his party's major financier, probably the most important reason for his gubernatorial nomination. An exponent of modern industrial practices — cheap and efficient production, intensive sales promotion--Douglas was also widely reputed to be a fair employer, paying good wages, financing a medical program for his employees, working under the union label, and hiring only union labor, and his campaign received strong support from the state's labor leaders.[21]

In his inaugural address, Douglas revealed much of this background. Sympathetic to labor, he called for a shorter work day, restrictions on excessive overtime, hygienic reforms in the mills, and decried the human suffering involved in the devastating Fall River textile strike in progress. He asserted that Massachusetts' economy benefitted from high wages which allowed for the efficient production of high quality goods, and that where industrial difficulties existed in the state, they were usually due to high tariff duties. Reflecting his particular boot and shoe interests, he urged support for decreases in the duties on hides. In addition, Douglas suggested that Massachusetts' industrial future depended upon a broader knowledge of its industries on the part of the working man and the provision of more systematic opportunities for learning a trade.

---

[21] Richard Abrams, Conservatism in a Progressive Era (Cambridge, 1964), pp. 105-08, 119-21; Henry Bedford, Socialism and the Workers in Massachusetts, 1886-1912 (Amherst, 1966), pp. 113, 206-07, 220-23.

> A practical knowledge of an industry as a whole, and of the sciences upon which its rests, would open the doors to promotion for many bright workers now compelled to work at a machine or bench. If a considerable part of our factory employees had a more comprehensive knowledge of the industry in which they were engaged, they would be quicker to appreciate and adopt improvements, we would have better foremen and superintendents, our factories would be better conducted and our industries would make greater progress.[22]

Douglas's vague call for schooling in industrial practices struck a responsive chord among the state's legislators, and in May, 1905, the legislature asked the Governor to appoint nine individuals "representing manufacturing, agricultural, educational and labor interests" to a Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. "The Commission," the legislative resolution declared, "shall investigate the needs for education in the different grades of skill and responsibility in the various industries of the Commonwealth. They shall investigate how far the needs are met by existing institutions, and shall consider what new forms of educational effort may be advisable...."[23]

That the new forms would be biased toward some form of trade training was almost a foregone conclusion when Douglas announced his Commission appointments. From the shoe center of Brockton, the home of Douglas's factory, came two friends of the governor, George E. Keith, a fellow shoe manufacturer, bank president, and influential figure on the School Board, and Warran A. Reed, lawyer and wealthy Municipal Court Judge. Simeon B. Chase, a banker and textile manufacturer, and John Golden, President of the United Textile Workers of America, were both from Fall River where management and union were cooperating in support of a textile training school for supervisory personnel and evening trade training. Nathaniel I. Bowditch, wealthy trustee of the Massachusetts Agricultural College in Amherst, an institution already committed to advancing vocational education,represented agriculture. Mary Morton Kehew, president of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union,was similarly involved in extending trade training to females in the Boston area, while the Commission's chairman, Carroll D.Wright, former Director of the Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor and U.S. Commissioner of Labor, recently appointed President of Clark College, had already established himself as a supporter of technical industrial schooling. Potential opposition to trade schooling existed on the Commission, primarily in George H. Martin, Secretary of the State Board of Education, a moderate educational reformer who had come to accept limited manual training programs, in John P. Murphy, general organizer of the Lynn Boot and Shoe Workers' Union, and to a lesser extent in Golden, as union representatives fearful of schools which might flood the skilled labor market.[24]

---

[22] Annual Address of the Governor...to the Legislature of Massachusetts," Massachusetts Senate Documents, 1905, #1, pp. 9-20, 23-24, 49-50.

[23] "Resolve of the Committee on Education," ibid., #264; Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, pp. 1-2.

---

[24] Brief biographies of the Commission's members may be found in Massachusetts Department of Education, The Douglas Commission and the Commission on Industrial Education (Boston, 1935), in Massachusetts State Library. See also "Mary Morton Kehew," Dictionary of American Biography, X, 287-88; "George E. Keith," Boston Transcript, 12/19/20, p.7."John Golden," ibid., 6/9/21, p. 9. Daniel Horowitz, "Response to

Appointed in June, the Douglas Commission conducted a series of twenty public hearings in twelve Massachusetts cities between September and December, 1905, while appointing Kingsbury to investigate industrial conditions and the educational needs of the state's fourteen to sixteen year old children. The hearings revealed the cross currents of conflicting and self-interested attitudes toward industrial education, with representatives of labor and management, schoolmen, and assorted citizenry calling for educational commitments to satisfy their own needs. Manufacturers and employers, contending that the skilled and semi-skilled labor market was inadequate, called for more extentive support of industrial education for specific work skills. Social reformers tended to argue for schooling directed explicitly at the immigrant poor and the working class, although they tended to keep the two groups distinct. Labor leaders, fearful of a too-rapid increase in the supply of trained workers, rejected the notion of schooling in trades and asked for training for those already on the job designed to advance workers to supervisory positions. Agriculturalists demanded schooling in farm techniques and at minimum asked for school gardens in urban schools. Hearings in individual cities -- Lynn and Brockton were outstanding examples -- exposed conflicts between school officials, manufacturers, and union representatives only tangentially related to schooling.[25]

---

[24] (cont.) Industrialism," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1966, pp. 187-88 has a brief discussion of Carroll Wright's view on industrial schooling. On George Martin and industrial education, see Industrial Education and the Public Schools: An Address Before the Massachusetts Teachers' Association (Boston, 1908), reprinted in Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1907-08, pp. 297-316; Krug, Shaping of the American High School, p. 219; and pp. 247-48 below. Krug pp. 218-21 contains a brief discussion of the Commission and its work.

[25] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, pp. 2-3; ibid., "Hearings, passim, ms. in Massachusetts State Library. The hearings are a mine of information on educational concerns of the period. On the

More revealing than conflict and diversity, however, was the consensus which emerged out of the hearings and within the Commission itself. Adopting as already established what educators had claimed for more than two decades, the Douglas Commission found that the balance between job learning (the apprenticeship system) and school learning had been destroyed, that "in place of two systems of training, balancing each other and mutually cooperative, there came to be but one, absorbing all the time and thought and interest of the children and youth, -- a system of education isolated and one-sided." Aggravated by the congestion of population in the cities, children were becoming increasingly isolated from productive labor, disabling their economic future and undermining the state's economy. Responsible to itself and its citizenry, the state, as European countries had already come to realize, had to provide for industrial schooling. Acknowledging the expense of such instruction, the Commission added that responsibility could no longer be left to the local school districts.[26]

More significant, the Commission condemned the philosophy and condition of

---

(25 con't.) manufacturers' support of trade schools, see the testimony of George A. Denison and Charles Bosworth (10/18), H.C. Wood (10/19), Albion Bartlett (11/13) and T.J. Evans (11/10). On organized labor's fears, see statements by Frank Foster and Albert Hibbert (10/24), and by labor representatives in Lynn (11/3), Lawrence (11/8), and Brockton (11/10). For the support of textile schools by members of the Textile Union, see their testimony in Fall River (11/27). The social reformers were best represented by Robert Woods (9/22). Testimony in favor of agricultural education occurred on 11/22, but should be supplemented by the remarks of Walter D. Ross, a dealer in agricultural supplies (10/19) and Herman Dressel and George Hastings, school officials in Great Barrington and Fitchburg, respectively (11/1). The hearings that produced the bitterest conflict between manufacturers, labor, and school officials took place in Lynn (11/3) and Brockton (11/10). Some of the hearings were reported in the Boston Transcript, 9/12, p. 3; 9/22, p. 2; 9/29, p. 2; 9/24, p. 2.

[26] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, pp. 3-10, 16-19. On the Commission's assessment of conditions in European and testimony by European experts, see ibid., pp. 129-78.

manual training as a travesty of Massachusetts' needs. Too infrequently given, without any recognizable standards of instruction, poorly equipped, and taught by individuals unable and unwilling to convey its industrial uses, manual education had become a caricature of modern industrialization while its universalist concerns ignored the needs of the laboring class and the state's economy. "It seems as if the old academic idea that there was something unacademic in studying anything that would later on be a means of earning bread and butter has been exaggerated in the development of the manual training system," Robert Woods told the Commission. Adopting Woods' position, the Commission wrote that manual education had become "a cultural subject mainly useful as a stimulus to other forms of intellectual effort, --a sort of mustard relish, an appetizer, --to be conducted without reference to any industrial end. It has been severed from real life as completely as have the other school activities." "The present public school system," the Commission concluded, "is aimed primarily to secure cultural and not industrial or vocational effects...."[27]

These conclusions did not stand alone. "The latest philosophy of education re-enforces the demands of productive industry by showing that that which fits a child best for his place in the world as a producer tends to his own highest development physically, intellectually and morally." Vocational education -- schooling for a specific job -- had already become an accepted feature of the state's educational system, the Commission claimed. Confusing occupational categories with individual vocations, it asserted that a "large part of the burden of high school maintenance" was devoted to college preparation, and thus was vocationally directed toward the professions. Bookkeeping, typing, and stenography courses had as their only justification jobs in commercial establishments. Advanced training in industrial and agricultural techniques occurred a t the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Worcester Polytechnical Institute, and the Massachusetts Agricultural College, as well as at the textile schools in Lowell, New Bedford, and Fall River. Actual productive processes, however, were "only touched educationally in their most advanced and scientific forms." Although a number of private and philanthropic agencies taught trades, "no instruction whatever is furnished at public expense in the principles or practice of farming, dairying, gardening, the building trades, cabinet making, machine shop practice, boot and shoe making, tanning, printing, book binding, dressmaking, millinery, embroidery, design." Massachusetts school children, the Commission suggested, had to be taught how to produce. When combined with Susan Kingsbury's conclusions that fourteen to sixteen year olds would benefit from industrial training, the Douglas Commission had its recommendations.[28]

---

[27] Statement by Robert A. Woods in Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, "Hearings," 9/22; ibid., Report, pp. 14, 23. See also the remarks by F.A. Bagnall, Superintendent of Schools in Adams, and Carroll Wright (12/19). The question of why manual training was so inadequately taught was raised on a number of occasions during the hearings but never pursued. See the remarks by George Martin (9/29), Charles T. Woodbury, Principal of the Fitchburg High School (11/2), and the testimony given in Pittsfield (11/1).

In the elementary schools, children should be instructed and given practice in the elements of productive industry. Work in the high schools should be modified "so that the instruction in mathematics, the sciences and drawing shall show the application and use of these subjects in industrial life, with especial reference to local industries, so that the students may see that these subjects are not designed primarily and solely for academic purposes, but that they may be utilized for the purposes of practical life." The Commission also recommended that new elective industrial courses be provided in the high schools, evening classes offered to persons already employed in the trades, and part-time day classes be made available for "children between the ages of fourteen and eighteen years who may be employed during the remainder of they day, to the end that instruction in the principles and the practice of the arts may go on together."[29]

---

[28] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, pp. 10-20.

Although the Douglas Commission had strongly criticized the condition of manual education in the state, these recommendations in themselves did not represent a major break with the earlier movement. Industrial education in the elementary schools was still to be "of such a character as to secure from it the highest cultural as well as the highest industrial value." The desire to bring industrial associations into the academic curriculum and to widen elective alternatives had been apparent since the 1880's and 1890's, though in less pronounced form. Similarly, evening trade programs and requests for part time education for school dropouts were not novel, although again, they had rarely received such prestigious support. What did represent a dramatic break with the past, however, was the Commission's recommendation that a Commission on Industrial Education be established which would stand outside the bounds of the traditional public school authorities and would have full power to implement industrial schooling under public auspices.

> The commission on industrial education shall be charged with the duty of extending the investigation of methods of industrial training and of local needs, and it shall advise and aid in the introduction of industrial education in the independent schools, as hereinafter

---

[29] Ibid., pp. 20-21.

> provided; and it shall provide for lectures on the importance of industrial education and kindred subjects, and visit and report upon all special schools in which such education is carried on. It may initiate and superintend the establishment and maintenance of industrial schools for boys and girls in various centers of the state, with the co-operation and consent of the municipality involved or the municipalities constituent of any district to be formed by the union of towns and cities as hereinafter provided. The commission shall have all necessary powers in the conduct and maintenance of industrial schools, and money appropriated by the state and municipality for their maintenance shall be expended under its direction.[30]

With this proposal, the Douglas Commission altered the nature of Massachusetts' educational discussions. Manual training versus academic schooling, manual education versus vocational education now became debates of the past. Challenged by a threat to their power from an independent industrial education commission, Massachusetts' schoolmen quickly accepted the arguments for vocational industrial training and directed their concern toward questions of control. The implications of that decision were momentous. Schooling designed to correct the social disharmonies of a threatened society became training for particular places in that society. Ambivalences about industrialization turned to glorification. Equality of educational opportunity moved from the provision of a common education to separate kinds of instruction for different kinds of pupils. The significance of these changes remained unclear during the fierce struggle for control of the state's school system which followed the Douglas Commission report. At that struggle's conclusion, however, a consensus on this new ideology of public education had emerged.

---

[30] Ibid., pp. 20-24.

# CHAPTER VI

# THE POLITICS OF VOCATIONALISM

## I

The report of the Douglas Commission helped end an era. Considered by many the "Magna Charta of vocational education," its summary assertion that manual training had become a cultural appetizer incapable of fulfilling the needs of youth in an urban-industrial society foreclosed more than a quarter century's debate among Massachusetts' educators. Henceforth manual education as social restoration would be irretrievably linked with academic subjects as part of traditional culture-oriented schooling. At the same time, vocational education in Massachusetts became synonymous with training in industrial processes, schooling for the industrial trades, and, to a considerably lesser extent, with agricultural instruction. The Douglas report, wrote Charles R. Richards of Columbia Teachers College , a prime mover in the organization of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education just after the Massachusetts report appeared, stood "in striking contrast" to earlier educational documents. It has "extended far below the operation and results of the present meagre provision for industrial training to the actual conditions under which children enter the industries, the demands of the industries upon them, the opportunity for development and the relation of the school to the whole problem." The report made clear, Richards believed, that public school authorities were incapable of providing truly vocational education, while its call for independent industrial schools provided the basis for "special training for a special class for a special place in the social order." James Haney, a co-sponsor with Richards of the Society for Industrial Education and editor of Manual Training

*Magazine*, which despite its name was in the forefront of the industrial schooling movement chastized the Douglas Commission for only recommending independent industrial schools rather than demanding them, but added that the report "bids fair to be an epoch-making document, chiefly by reason of its radical recommendation in favor of an industrial school system apart from the public school system of the state....No one anxious to be in touch with the increasing movement toward industrial training can afford to ignore it."[1]

With only slight modification -- a three year rather than five year term of appointment and State funds only for industrial schools independent of public school systems rather than for new industrial courses in already existing schools or new schools under local school committees -- the Douglas Commission's recommendation that a Commission on Industrial Education be created was quickly implemented by the legislature and governor. Appointed in August, 1905, the new Commission's membership strikingly resembled that of its predecessor, with one notable exception. Whereas George Martin, the moderate Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, had represented the state's public schoolmen on the Douglas Commission, the only educator on the new Commission on Industrial Education and its dominant figure was chairman Paul H. Hanus, Professor of Education at Harvard University, and one of the state's leading advocates of vocational schooling. Joining Hanus on the Commission were A. Lincoln Filene, businessman and chairman of the board of William Filene's and Sons, Charles H. Winslow, vice president of the Massachusetts State Federation of Labor, Carlton D. Richardson, member of the State Board of Agriculture, and Mary Morton Kehew, a carryover from the Douglas Commission and President of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union.[2]

---

[1] Massachusetts Department of Education, *The Douglas Commission and the Commission on Industrial Education* (Boston, 1935); Charles R. Richards, "The Report of the Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education," *Manual Training Magazine*, 7:7/06, 185-95; editorial and review of Commission's report, by Haney, *ibid.*, pp. 224-25, 247-48; Krug, *Shaping of the American High School* (New York, 1964), pp. 214, 217, 223. A strong supporter of the Douglas Report, Charles Warner, Principal of the Evening Trades School in Springfield, whose proposals exerted considerable influence over the Commission and were published as an appendix to the report, offered a more modest suggestion that the cultural gains of manual training not be rejected entirely, and that both vocational and manual

The Commission's definition of its role in the state's educational system quickly became apparent in its search for an executive secretary. Committed to differentiating the old program of manual training as social education from the new industrial schooling as vocational training, Hanus demanded that the Commission's appointee have "technical training in a technical school of high grade, must have had successful experience in at least one important industry, must have a decided interest in industrial education, and, if possible, must have had some educational experience." [ML's italics] Recognizing that considerable confusion existed in the state over what industrial education was, what kind was necessary, and how it was to be implemented, the new secretary would have to

---

1 (con't.)
instruction should be given. Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, (Boston, 1906), pp. 178-96 and Werner's comments in Manual Training Magazine, 8:4/07, 167-73. The Douglas Commission report exerted widespread influence over the development of industrial education throughout the country. Within two years of its appearance, it had gone through almost 5,000 copies. Edward Krug, p. 217, calls it the "precipitating event" in a wave of demands for industrial education. For an example of the use to which the Commission's arguments were put, see Charles Bennett, "The Manual Arts: To What Extent Shall They be Influenced by the Recent Movement Toward Industrial Education," Manual Training Magazine 8:7/07, 189-95.

[2] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1907, pp. 7-9 Kehew was soon replaced by Milton P. Higgins, a prominent industrial manufacturer and long time activist for educational innovation in the state. Emily G. Balch, social worker and faculty member at Wellesley College was later added when agitation developed over the inclusion of a woman on the Commission after Kehew left due to failing health. On the Commission's members, see Massachusetts Department of Education, The Douglas Commission. Hearings on the Douglas Commission's proposal for an independent industrial education commission were reported in the Boston Transcript, 4/30/06, p. 4.

"take the initiative in investigations and in the directing of investigations into various industries of Massachusetts, with a view of determining the kind or kinds of education that may be helpful to employers and employees." Since the Commission would also assume responsibility for establishing industrial schools and programs, he would have to be "able to advise and co-operate as only a well-trained expert can." The requirements demanded of its executive secretary -- experience in industry, a background in advanced technical training, investigatory and research capabilities, and political tact -- on a broader scale also emcompassed the needs of the new Commission. With the choice of Charles Morse, Superintendent of the Rindge Manual Training School in Cambridge, after a nationwide search, the Commission hoped to satisfy those needs.[3]

Morse seemed an ideal appointment. Forty-six years old, a graduate of one of the state's normal schools, and a former grammar school teacher and principal, he came from within Massachusetts' educational establishment. In 1889, he arrived in Cambridge where his joint appointment as a faculty member in the city's English High School and head of the academic department of the Manual Training School made clear Cambridge's attempt to integrate manual training and academic learning. While teaching physics and electricity at Manual Training, Morse simultaneously took advanced technical courses at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, became an accomplished machine worker and cabinet maker, and was placed in charge of the city's electrical power systems. Since 1895, Morse had been superintendent of the Rindge School, while continuing to act as an electrical and mechanical consultant to various engineering firms in the Boston metropolitan area.[4]

---

[3] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1907, pp. 10-11.

[4] Ibid., pp. 11-12. On Morse's views, see Charles Morse, "Elementary Trade Teaching," in Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Industrial Education, 23:1/09, 33-41.

Morse thus combined an acquaintance with the newest industrial innovation --electricity -- and more than a decade's experience as head of Cambridge's highly regarded manual training high school, and his appointment revealed the Industrial Education Commission's desire to advance industrial education while disarming fear among the state's public educators. Despite Morse's obvious capabilities, however, he never assumed leadership of the Commission. Within that body and to the public at large, the dominant voice for industrial schooling in Massachusetts was the Commission's chairman, Harvard University professor, Paul Hanus.

A childhood emigrant from Germany and a graduate of the University of Michigan in 1878, Hanus had spent most of his career before coming to Massachusetts as a high school and college teacher in Colorado. In 1891, he had arrived in Cambridge as Assistant Professor of the History and Art of Teaching at Harvard, responsible for organizing a new department of education at the University and had become, in the next decade and a half, one of the state's leading professional educators, an aggressive and articulate spokesman for the science of pedagogy and systematic schooling. A strong advocate of trade education even before the Douglas report, Hanus regarded the Commission's recommendations as a major breakthrough in American educational development. The report, he wrote, opened the way to "nothing more nor less than the establishment of a new kind of public education on a foundation as secure as that of the existing public schools, but with a different motive. It means the establishment of schools for vocational training as such, as distinct from the existing public schools, the purpose of which is general education." Defining "good citizenship" in terms of "self-support and the capacity for increasing usefulness, and hence an increasing wage or salary," Hanus claimed that the public school's major function should be "preparation for a vocation."

> There is no greater blessing in this world than a steady job, with increasing efficiency and hence increasing wages as time goes on; and the only way to insure that happy state for each individual is to give him the training for some skilled vocation in life whether it be in business, in a trade, or in a profession.[5]

Citing Susan Kingsbury's study of school dropouts, rapidly becoming an essential text of the industrial education movement, Hanus asserted that public education had become undemocratic, that it neglected the vocational future of the majority to benefit a minority. The "wasted years," endemic to the school dropout, both destroyed individual lives and disabled Massachusetts' industrial efficiency. Tying his adopted state's economic future to the skill of its workers, Hanus agreed with the Douglas Commission that the schools failed to "directly prepare the majority of our young people for self-support, with the prospect of steady work and the means of progressive well-being; and these are the fundamental elements of social efficiency." In a society threatened by inefficiency and waste, public education was responsible less for general social values than for vocational preparation. The dominant question confronting the school and, more directly, the Commission on Industrial Education was being raised by society's fourteen and fifteen year old children: "What shall I do to ensure early self-support and progressive well-being as I grow older?" The answer, Hanus concluded, had to be industrial schooling for vocational placement.[6]

---

[5] Paul Hanus, Adventuring in Education (Cambridge, 1937), pp. 247-51, passim; Hanus, "Industrial Education, Under State Auspices, in Massachusetts," Commission on Industrial Education, Bulletin, #8, pp. 3-5 (reprinted in Hanus, Beginnings in Industrial Education and Other Educational Discussions, (Boston, 1908), pp. 29-52); Hanus, "Public Trade Schools," The Bulletin of the Winona Technical Institute, 5:8/09. Hanus was also a prime mover in the founding of the Harvard Graduate School of Education in 1920. Adventuring, pp. 214-27.

[6] Hanus, "Industrial Education," pp. 5-14; ibid., Adventuring, pp. 169-70. The

With Hanus shaping its policies, the Commission directed its efforts toward informing the public of the value and goals of vocational schooling, investigating various industrial education programs in the United States and Europe, and trying to aid communities in establishing independent industrial schools. "Manual training, Hanus wrote in 1908, seeking to distinguish the two forms of hand learning, while justifying the Industrial Education Commission's existence, "has for its object general education; the education of the mind, in part, through the hand."

> Its motive is educational, not vocational. If properly and adequately carried on, it gives the pupil a general acquaintance with technical and constructive activity, and it may make a pupil generally 'handy.' But it does not go farther. And even those schools in which the manual training idea is most fully developed -- the manual training, mechanic arts and so-called technical high schools, all of which are of the same grade in this State -- often distinctly state that they make no attempt to teach a trade; and it is a fact that, as a rule, they send only a small fraction of their graduates into the trades.

In these terms manual training had limited value to the fourteen and fifteen year old school dropout doomed to unskilled industrial labor. "The term 'industrial education' is, on the contrary," Hanus contended, "now used to signify technical training of a specific character; it means training for individual trades or industrial vocations," "specific education required for a particular calling."[7]

The Commission's most ambitious attempt to elaborate what vocational education might encompass came in a seriesof extensive surveys of European and American indus-

---

6(con't.)
essentials of Hanus's views on industrial education are presented in Beginnings, pp. 4-86. Hanus tended to be less extreme on vocational education when he wos not specifically discussing the subject. See his balanced analysis of secondary education in Hanus, Educational Aims and Educational Values (New York, 1908), pp. 71-138.

[7] Massachusetts Commission on Inudstrial Educarion, Annual Report, 1907, p. 14-18 and remarks by Hanus to labor representatives and at a town meeting in Pittsfield, pp. 29-

trial and agricultural schools undertaken in 1907 and 1908. Executive secretary Charles Morse toured the eastern and southern United States reporting on projects in Tuskegee, Alabama; Columbus, Georgia; Hampton, Virginia; and New York City among others. Commission member Carlton Richardson similarly visited agricultural schools in the northwestern United States and Canada, while Morse and the labor representative on the Commission, Charles Winslow, investigated educational conditions in Western Europe. The last of these -- the European visits -- were undoubtedly the most comprehensive of the investigations, and made clear the Commission's desire to establish a broadly based rationale for government-sponsored vocational schooling, for uniform and systematic trade training, and for the economic advantages of industrial schooling to the state, employer and worker.[8]

## II

Since the 1870's, when the industrial drawing movement had placed great emphasis upon the relationship between technical schooling and industrial progress in England, France, and Germany, Europe had become increasingly prominent in American educational debates. By the turn of the century, European examples were commonplace, and

---

7(con't.)
45; ibid., 1908, pp. 13-16, 20-21, and special reports on "Attitude of the Manufacturing Interests in Twenty Massachusetts Cities Towards Industrial Education" and "Advisability of Establishing One or More Technical Schools or Industrial Colleges," pp. 619-28, 629-39, respectively; Hanus, Adventuring, pp. 168-74 is a retrospective view of the Commission's work.

[8] The Richardson and Morse reports were published as Appendices E and F of the Commission's 1908 Annual Report. The report on Western Europe by Morse and Winslow as Appendix A. Abstracts of all three are in ibid., pp. 34-50, and reveal a good deal of selectivity in summarizing the more detailed findings. Winslow also studied "The Relations of European Industrial Schools to Labor," ibid., pp. 51-57, 420-39. Agricultural education received attention as part of the Commission's focus on productive industries, to be differentiated from commercial and service vocations, but it never assumed significant importance.

the Douglas Commission had unhesitatingly sought testimony from English technical training advocates and drawn upon studies by the United States Commissioner of Labor (1902) and the United States Department of Commerce and Labor (1905) on industrial conditions and education in Europe and Germany to support its arguments for industrial vocational schools. Enumerating the widespread support for such schooling abroad, the cooperation of government, industry and labor, and the "universal recognition of the necessity of special education for every form of industrial life," the Douglas Commission's response to Europe could be succinctly summarized: industrial education there far surpassed American practices. "The scope of this education is so broad [in Europe]," wrote the Commission, "its forms are so multifarious, its methods are so scientific, its hold upon public opinions is so complete, the impulse which it is giving to industrial leadership is so powerful, as to entitle it to the most thoughtful and respectful study."[9]

These conclusions undoubtedly acted as the stimuli that sent Morse and Winslow to nineteen European cities in England, France, Switzerland, Germany, Belgium, Holland, Scotland, and Ireland in 1907. Expecting confirmation of what the Douglas Commission had already reported, the two Americans responded accordingly, finding in European solutions suggestions for Massachusetts' problems. Yet if Morse and Winslow's report on their European adventures was generally enthusiastic, it was also tempered by some confusion, a bit of uncertainty, and, in the case of England, the country in which they had the least difficulty communicating, a good deal of doubt about the progress and uses to which industrial education could be put.

---

[9] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, pp. 13, 17-18, 129-77.

Judging from previous reports and their published statements, Morse and Winslow were obviously disappointed and even irritated over the state of industrial schooling in England. Legislation in 1899 and 1902 had seemed to signify a major national commitment by the English to advancing the technical and industrial training of the working class, and the Douglas Commission had presented a highly favorable picture of the situation there.

> There are some obstacles necessarily met with in installing an innovation of this kind, such as the indifference of employers to the progress of technical education; but this indifference is being gradually overcome, many employers being greatly in favor of technical education, and striving to stimulate it by offering prizes for excellence in studies and paying in whole or in part the fees of their workmen at the trade. Employers...are realizing more and more the importance of technical education, and prefer school-trained apprentices, paying such better wages than they would receive were they not so trained.

With the trade unions now strong supporters of the movement, the only serious obstacle to industrial education, the Commission concluded, was "the poor general education of the English workman."[10]

A year later, however, first hand acquaintance elicited significantly less optimism. While the government had launched a nationalization drive by providing for industrial schooling, educational practices continued to vary considerably. Appalled by the poor state of elementary education for the children of workingmen, the widespread apathy toward industrial training among employers and workers and, worst of all, the explicit anti-democratic bias used to justify training for a particular place in a highly stratified class society, the Americans saw little hope for major advances in either industry or education among the English. "We have not the enthusiasm for education in England which you possess," one government technical school official told the Commission's investigators. "I can quite believe you are 25 years ahead of us...Even teachers here are often pessimistic over technical training. They have the knowledge that a boy will most likely have to do one certain job all his life, so they are inclined to ask, What is the use of training him technically?" Other technical education advocates reported on the industrial lethargy which plagued their country. Where industrial schooling did occur, it focused on evening classes rather than the day schools which the Americans hoped to develop.

---

[10] Ibid., p. 130.

The best English facility, the Manchester School of Technology, housed in a new building costing $1,500,000 had been in operation so long that it found itself encumbered by much useless machinery. "Parenthetically," the investigators continued, "the opinion expressed by one of the Manchester authorities, that the equipment of the New Bedford Textile School in Massachusetts was the best that he had ever seen, is interesting." Even London, whose industrial schooling they commended, directed its major effort toward "some 8,000 destitute children," recalling philanthropic rather than industrial-vocational goals. In short, England was a major disappointment, its workshops inefficient and hardly moving toward change, its industrial schooling inadequate and being undermined by the acceptance of a stratified class society.[11]

The Massachusetts investigators found industrial education considerably more satisfactory in the other European countries, though one suspects not least because language difficulties prevented as close an analysis as they had given England. Largely defining European practices in terms of the problems confronting Massachusetts, they perceived the heterogeneity of the Continent as reflecting a universal movement toward nationally subsidized trade schooling managed independently of the already existing educational establishment. Whether discussing Holland where sharp controversy was occurring over trade schools, France where a long tradition of artisan schooling existed, or any of the other countries they visited, the Americans found the same trends: government subsidies, industrial education outside the control of educators, and immediate economic benefits resulting from trade instruction. "In Germany, as in the other European countries," the Massachusetts Commission summarized its investigators' report, "the State takes the liveliest interest in the encouragement of local industries. It has been distinctly recognized that there must be a proper blending of purely educational and purely industrial forces in order to produce the desired effects in industrial education. Nevertheless, in this combination it is the industrial force which has had the administrative duties to perform; the purely educational force has been active chiefly in an advisory capacity."[12]

---

[11] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1908, pp. 97-102, 110
11, 115. The discussion of England appears on pp. 97-159, summary on pp. 40-41.

These themes, as the above quotation suggests, were most manifest in Germany, the center of Europe's industrial education movement. By 1900, Americans had already become enamored with Germany's industrial accomplishments, and the Douglas Commission in 1906 had sought to relate those developments to industrial schooling: "Trade education has made great progress in Germany during the last few decades, and its development has corresponded with a most remarkable advance of scientific knowledge and industry." A year later, the Commission on Industrial Education published a highly laudatory report written by Chairman Hanus on industrial continuation schools in Munich. Commending the city for successfully maintaining "a unique and wholly admirable system of technical continuation schools, whereby those who must leave school at about thirteen or fourteen years of age are well trained for the several callings on which they enter," Hanus acknowledged Germany's leadership in trade instruction and suggested that the continuation schools which provided post-school training for children approximately the same age as Massachusetts' elementary school dropouts were worthy of emulation. Based on the "general principle universally recognized in Germany, -- that efficiency in any calling, from chimney-sweeping to watchmaking, requires special training for that particular calling," the continuation schools were compulsory for all elementary school graduates, six to ten hours per week for three to four years. Children attended the school specifically designed for the trade or business they were presently employed in. While the "whole series of schools is too new to enable them all to be equally efficient," Hanus admitted, "yet it is safe to say that no more promising educational scheme has ever been set on foot anywhere; and the success attending the opening of the first of these schools in 1900 led the city to extend them with constantly increasing success, until now there are forty of them."[13]

---

[12] Ibid., pp. 45, 47-8, 159-61, 218-23, 362-69, 392-96. For the complete discussion of Continental Europe, see pp. 159-419. "Abstracts" are on pp. 41-50.

The Munich continuation schools thus seemed a promising solution for "the problem of how to keep under appropriate educational influence during their period of adolescence that great body of youth who are obliged to leave school when only thirteen or fourteen years old." Compulsory attendance meant a punctual and regular student body, industrial goals were kept uppermost and the schools' governing boards included representatives from the trades and business, assuring instructional contact with "actual contemporary needs." "The schools embody a well-defined policy that underlies all forms of activity in Germany; namely, that every efficient worker, whether in trade, business or profession, requires general education, and also technical preparation, for the particular work he is to do."[14]

---

[13] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, p. 138; Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1907, pp. 46-51. The Commission also published more detailed studies by Hanus on the continuation schools. Ibid., Bulletins, #1-6. In retrospect, Hanus revised his views of the Munich schools, suggesting that they were limited by their role in a stratified society: "The merits of these vocational continuation schools were great, but the schools were not intended to help workers to rise above the stations in which they had been born. They were intended to make good workmen, not to enable a worker to become a manager or other executive." Adventuring, p. 167.

With these conclusions before them, seeming to touch on the central problems posed by the Kingsbury study, it was hardly surprising that Morse and Winslow should proclaim that the "technical industrial schools of Germany are justly celebrated for their thorough, systematic and comprehensive instruction." For more than sixty pages, the Americans established the variety and quality of German industrial education from the continuation trade schools for the young to the sophisticated technical colleges for advanced scholars. Still, all was not perfect. Although variety seemed to reflect extensive commitment, it also revealed a lack of uniformity, made standards difficult to ascertain, and raised serious questions about efficiency. Unwilling to criticize what they had come to expect a model system, the Americans revealed the dilemma of their confusion when they noted the heterogeneity within one type of school: "Perhaps it would be permissible to say that these schools are all intended to fulfill the same general object, but that differences in details arise from different ideas as to the manner in which results may be attained, as well as the different local conditions which exist and the different classes of persons to be provided for." Instruction, moreover, occasionally seemed too theoretical, while continuation schools outside of Munich frequently met in the evenings and Sundays rather than during the workday, a definite retrogression to the Massachusetts' day trade school enthusiasts.[15]

---

[14] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1907, pp. 46-51.

[15] Ibid ., 1908, pp. 259, 263-67. For the complete discussion of industrial education in Germany, see pp. 258-325, but see also the abstract summary, pp. 44-45.

Despite these caveats, however, Germany clearly presented Europe's best model. Increasing centralization would soon eliminate much of the confusion. Industrial schooling and industrial progress seemed inextricably linked in the national economy, and the Commission on Industrial Education could conclude that Germany was "giving the same careful consideration to its industrial schools that it has given to its schools for general education, which have brought about such splendid results."[16]

The American investigators had gone to Europe in search of reinforcement. Looking for examples and parallels to the existing situation in Massachusetts, not surprisingly they were most struck by active state involvement, the placing of industrial education under autonomous bodies reflecting industrial needs rather than under the already functioning educational establishments, and the immediate economic rewards of industrial schooling. Yet their report was equally revealing for what it expressed displeasure about and for what it left unsaid. Concerned about justifying industrial education at home as a democratic innovation designed to give each child the opportunity to achieve his most suitable economic and social level, Morse and Winslow were highly critical of the acceptance of a class structured society in England, and the uses of different kinds of educational training there to retain that structure. Equally revealing, outside of England, their assessment of industrial schooling included no mention of class distinctions, no attempt was made to ask whether rigid class structures on the Continent were reinforced or undermined by industrial education. Questions about the nature of a democratic educational system seemed best unraised. Morse and Winslow also had little to say about modern industry, about the factory and industrial worker as distinct from the workshop and artisan. Most excited by such skilled artisan training institutions as the Estienne School for the Arts and Industries of Book Making in Paris and the school for watchmakers in Geneva, their praise seemed continually to focus upon craft and artistic instruction, the restoration of the handicraftsman in an industrial society. In their voluminous report of what they had seen in Europe, the two American investigators left untouched the crucial question of the relationship between the industrial factory and the industrial school.[17]

---

[16] Ibid., p. 45.

## III

The investigations in Europe and at home revealed the academic and propagandist roles the Commission on Industrial Education had set for itself. More significant to its position as a functioning body, however, would be its ability to implement industrial trade education in the state. Here the Commission centered on two possibilities: the coordination and institutionalization of evening trade classes and the establishment of industrial day schools independent of local public school authorities. Although initial expectations had placed a higher priority upon the latter as the more significant innovation in public education, in practice, the former received more attention. By January, 1908, evening trade programs in architectural and mechanical drawing, machine shop work, dressmaking and millinery, and electricity has been established in Beverly, Cambridge, New Bedford, Waltham, and Taunton, while other classes were under active consideration in Attleborough, Boston, Lawrence, and North Adams. Yet if the Commission proudly offered these classes as significant progress in industrial schooling, the evening schools were hardly distinctive. Most represented mild revisions of already existing programs, now nominally transferred from the jurisdiction of the local school committee to the Commission on Industrial Education in order to qualify for state financing. Indeed, the change was so limited that the state legislature initially refused to recognize most of the evening industrial classes as independent schools, and delayed the provision of state funds until 1910.[18]

---

[17] On England, see Footnote 41 above. The Estienne School and the Geneva School of Horology are discussed ibid., pp. 173-93 and 230-32. See also the praise given to craft and artistic education in Belgium, pp. 325-29.

Considerably more controversial among the state's educators and within local communities, and thus more difficult to achieve was the Commission's mandate to establish day industrial schools. Despite intensive propagandizing by Chairman Hanus and Executive Secretary Morse and some initial movement toward such schools, few Massachusetts cities actually instituted them under the Commission's guidelines. Even with the proffered state aid, Lowell's Superintendent of Schools reported in 1907, separate industrial schools meant additional large expenditures which most cities could ill afford, and he suggested that existing schools provide industrial training. Similarly, while Worcester's Superintendent applauded the Industrial Education Commission's work, he noted that his city's school committee could undertake "an important part in this new education." These difficulties -- additional expenses demanded by new industrial schools and the unwillingness of local school authorities to release control over a significant portion of public education -- almost invariably dulled the Commission's ability to achieve its expectations. Nevertheless, when a superintendent and school committee were committed to industrial education, compromises could be worked out and an industrial school established, as events in New Bedford revealed.[19]

By the fall, 1908, the New Bedford School Board had reorganized and transferred its evening classes in electrical training to the Commission on Industrial Education, and had formed an advisory committee of "employers, employees, practical men, members of a craft, and...members of labor unions" to oversee and enlarge the night school program. In mid-October, Superintendent of Schools Allen P. Keith consulted Hanus and Morse about the possibility of opening a day industrial school whose independence of the School Committee would only be nominal. The Commission, in the midst of controversy and concerned about its limited success in stimulating industrial schooling, was obviously unwilling to rebuff potential friends, and in a letter to the New Bedford Superintendent, Morse openly catered to the School Committee's desires.

---

[18] Ibid., pp. 66, 77-84, 86-89; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1908-09, pp. 143-53.

[19] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1908, pp. 86-92, ibid., 1909, pp. 74-79; Lowell, School Report, 1907, pp. 36-38; Worcester, School Report, 1908, pp. 42-44.

> In reply to your oral request made this morning for a statement as to the meaning of the word 'independent' as applied to schools established under the law relating to independent industrial schools, I would say: --
>
> The industrial school must be independent of existing schools in that it has an independent Board of Trustees and an independent director responsible to this Board of Trustees through its representative.
>
> The finances of the independent industrial school should be treated in a separate set of books and be in every way kept distinct from the other school expenditures of the city.
>
> I have no question as to the legality of appointing the sub-committee on high schools [of the School Committee] as the Board of Trustees of the independent industrial school. It would be entirely proper for the Board of Trustees of the independent industrial school to appoint as its agent the superintendent of schools....
>
> There could also be no objection to the pupils of the independent industrial school making use of the same assembly hall as that used by the pupils of...the classical high school.

With this assurance that the "independent" industrial school would remain under the supervision of a committee of the New Bedford School Board and the Superintendent of Schools, and still receive matching funds from the state, New Bedford opened its day industrial education classes in September, 1909.[20]

---

[20] Morse's letter is in New Bedford, "Minutes of the School Committee," 10/19/08, ms. in Office of the School Committee, New Bedford. For the events surrounding the industrial school's founding, see ibid., 11/4/07, 6/15/08, 7/1/08, 9/8/08, 10/19/08, 11/23/08, 2/7/10; The New Bedford Standard-Times, 10/1/08, 10/3/08, 10/20/08;

The quid pro quo worked out by Morse and the New Bedford School Committee represented as much a response by the Commission on Industrial Education to the political controversies surrounding its activities as an acceptance of New Bedford's desires. From its inception, the Commission had been the center of agitation over who would control public industrial schooling, the extent of which severely curtailed its ability to maneuver. None of this was entirely unexpected. When the Douglas Commission initially proposed a separate agency for industrial schooling, it recognized the possibilities of conflict between the new Commission on one side and local school authorities and the State Board of Education on the other. Independent industrial schools seemed necessary, however, the Douglas report affirmed, "because the present public school system is aimed primarily to secure cultural and not industrial or vocational effects, while the departure recommended by the Commission...secures a development of the principles of industrial instruction...."[21]

In the months which followed the new agency was never able effectively to overcome the hostility of either the State Board or local school officials. Chairman Paul Hanus later reported that Secretary of the Board of Education, George Martin, had explicitly refused to cooperate with the Commission.

> From time to time, when we tried to get a community interested in founding a vocational school (with a separate local board in immediate control as specified by the law), we found that an agent of the state board had been before us and had cultivated public opinion against such a school under our auspices, the agent having stated in effect, that there was no need of a separate local board under the commission to do what the local school committee could do with the help of the state board -- the state board being an old and well-established authority.

---

20 (con't.)
New Bedford, School Report, 1908, pp. 72-73. The School's operation is discussed in "Report of the Trustees of the New Bedford Industrial School," in New Bedford, School Report, 1909, pp. 89-93 and ibid., 1910, pp. 5-30. On Superintendent Allen Keith and Charles R. Allen, first director of the school, see clippings from New Bedford Standard-Times, 5/13/45, 3/4/45 in Emery Papers, New Bedford Public Library. Allen later became a nationally prominent spokesman for vocational education. See Charles A. Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (New York, 1925).

[21] Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report, p. 23.

Although the details may be incorrect, Hanus had pointed to his leading opponent among the state's schoolmen. Secretary Martin, while acknowledging the need for industrial schooling and claiming to have been the primary author of the Douglas Commission report, strongly urged the elimination of the divided authority in the state's system of public education. However, Martin rejected the argument that his Board had refused to cooperate with Hanus or that it opposed industrial schooling.

> The Board of Education stood ready to cooperate with the industrial commission, but its cooperation was never invited. It was never hostile, it was never jealous, it never interfered with the establishment of separate schools. Personally, I as secretary of the Board, have everywhere urged industrial education, and have done all in my power to make the work of the Industrial Commission possible....However, I am convinced that industrial education must be carried on side by side with general education, by the local school authorities, and as an integral part of the public school system.[22]

The Commission's political problems were further complicated by the dual role state senator Clinton Q. Richmond played as chairman of the legislative Committee on Education and member and advocate of the State Board of Education. In January, 1908, Governor Curtis Guild, Jr., a strong supporter of the Industrial Education Commission, suggested that the agency be made a permanent part of the state's public school system. Two separate bills to that effect were immediately introduced in the state House of Representatives, one by the Speaker of the House, and were referred to Richmond's Joint Committee on Education. Here, however, events took a marked change. Richmond, a close associate of Martin on the Board of Education, moved to limit the Commission's tenure, proposing instead of permanency a simple two-year extension of the original term. Making no criticism of industrial education, and indeed, commending its importance, Richmond contended that the state "cannot have two commanders to the educational army," and that the educational agencies should move toward union. Disclaiming any intention of hampering the Commission's work, Richmond asserted that the goal of a single board charged with responsibility for the state's public system could best be approached by continuing the Commission on Industrial Education on a short term basis.[23]

---

[22] Hanus, Adventuring, pp. 171-72; George H. Martin, "Remarks...Before the Legislative Committee on Education in Opposition to the Proposed Plan to Abolish the State Board of Education," 3/17/09, in Massachusetts State Library. See also Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1907-08, pp. 12-14; Krug, Shaping of the American High School, pp. 230-31.

Richmond's proposals elicited heated protest, and in a hearing on his bill in May, the Commission's supporters came out strong. Executive Secretary Morse found the Richmond bill incomprehensible since nobody--neither the governor, nor the members of the House who had proposed making the Commission permanent--had raised the issue of a short term extension. To enact the Richmond bill, Commission chairman Hanus declared, would signify a withdrawal of Massachusetts' heretofore avowed commitment to industrial schooling. Cities and towns, he testified, would be even more reluctant to allocate funds once they became uncertain of additional state financing. Trying to specify the need for permanency or a long term extension, Morse offered an example of the problems he faced.

> I have got to go to Natick 20 times before you would get a school established, and talk with different organizations as I have talked with one or two in Natick. I have got to talk with all parties. I have got to appear before the town meeting on the subject, and the whole town has got to be aroused to the necessity before they will vote the money. Now, I think you will grasp the situation at once, and see that for one town it is a tremendous job to develop the work. We are going to do it, but it will take time.

---

[23] "Annual Address of the Governor," Massachusetts Senate, Documents, 1908, #1; ibid., #335; Massachusetts House of Representatives, Documents, 1908, #801, #985; Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, "Hearings on Technical Education, May 15, 1908 on Senate Bill #335, pp. 51-55, typed ms. in Massachusetts State Library.

Others rejected Richmond's implication that public school educators--the State Board of Education or local school officials--should have control over industrial schooling. Frederick Fish, president of American Bell Telephone and a dissident member of the State Board of Education, claimed that the state's superintendents of schools "did not know the first thing about industrial education," and thus could not be expected to supervise it adequately.

> I have the greatest possible respect for the Board of Education. Its traditions from the day of Horace Mann have been not only creditable, which is a great deal, but have been worked out and developed on fine lines, and there is no organization in the state that I am more proud of, but like all other organizations that have lived and lived with a set type of education they simply cannot see the reading on the wall. They cannot see the necessity for this industrial education in the form which it has got to come. They cannot even take the lesson from foreign countries, and that lesson is tremendous.

Industrial education, affirmed Commission member A. Lincoln Filene, had to have a board "unhampered by very much of the traditions of the past."[24]

It was this conflict, between an educational agency--the State Board of Education and by extension local public school officials--steeped in the past and a board thoroughly committed to the present and future which seemed to define the issue for the supporters of the Commission on Industrial Education. Their perception of what was at stake was succinctly summarized by Robert Woods who called the Commission "the most important educational new departure that has been made in the United States during the last decade."

> On the one side, there are certain forces of education which are very anxious as to how this scheme of industrial education is going to dovetail in with our present general system of education. On the other side, there are a great many, who are represented by those of us who are addressing you just now, who are particularly concerned about having

---

[24] "Hearings on Technical Education," pp. 2-3, 5, 8-9, 15-17, 20-24, 33-34, 40-43, 49-51.

> this scheme of industrial education dovetail in properly with the industries of the state, and we feel...that it is ten times more important that the system of industrial education should dovetail in properly with our industries than that it should dovetail in with the technical arrangements which we have for carrying on our public schools.[25]

Despite this strong defense by the Commission's supporters, Richmond maneuvered his bill through the Senate and into the House where it passed after some attempts at amendment. More important, continuing public friction between the two educational agencies led incoming Governor Eben S. Draper, a manufacturer who actually favored separate industrial schools to recommend a merger of the State Board of Education and the Commission on Industrial Education. With the help of a series of compromises--reorganization of the State Board, including the appointment of a new Commissioner of Education to replace Secretary Martin, a special division of vocational education within the Board, the placing of Hanus on the reorganized Board, and a continuation of state financing of industrial schooling--the legislature voted to terminate the Commission on Industrial Education's existence as of July 1, 1909.[26]

## IV

The conflicts of 1906-09 between the Commission on Industrial Education and the

---

[25] Ibid., pp. 3, 39.

[26] Massachusetts House, Documents, 1908, #1665; Massachusetts House of Representatives, Journal, 1908, pp. 1211-12, 1217-18, 1241; Massachusetts Senate, Documents, 1909, #1, pp. 8-12, #16, #316. Massachusetts General Court, Acts and Resolves, 1908, Ch. 572; ibid., 1909, Ch. 457. Hearings on the merger legislation were held in March. Boston Transcript, 3/11, p. 2; 3/12, p.2; 3/16, p. 2; 3/17, p. 10; 3/18, p. 16. See also the comments by Alvin Dodd and Charles Prosser on the role of Massachusetts businessmen in the merger activities in What Chambers of Commerce Can Do for Vocational Education (New York, 1913), p. 22. Paul Hanus later claimed that he supported the merger of the two educational agencies, but if he did, it was undoubtedly after he recognized that the compromises would strengthen his hand at the expense of Martin. Adventuring, pp. 172-73.

State Board of Education had been mainly political, questions of who had power, and only secondarily, of what kind of schooling it was to be used for. The rhetoric, the demands, indeed, the very structure of the debates forced the State Board to support industrial education, while urging that it be channeled through "existing agencies." Whatever the political outcome, therefore, Massachusetts' schoolmen were already committing themselves to industrial-vocational schooling, toward trade training as a fundamental responsibility of public education. Governor Draper's suggestion that the two educational agencies merge as well as State Senator Richmond's attempts to terminate the Industrial Education Commission explicitly called for continued industrial schools and classes. The newly reorganized and enlarged Board of Education contained a preponderant majority in favor of industrial education, including its new chairman, Frederick Fish, the dissident Board member who had urged retention of the Industrial Education Commission, and Paul Hanus, the Commission's former chairman. One of the two deputy commissioners of education, positions created by the reorganization, was given separate responsibility for industrial schooling, while the state legislature eased its requirements for state funds to industrial education programs. And, perhaps most revealing, David Snedden, already on his way to becoming one of the nation's strongest advocates of separate industrial training classes and highly differentiated school programs, was appointed State Commissioner of Education to replace the moderate George Martin as head of Massachusetts' system of public schools.[27]

---

[27] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1907-08, pp. 12-14, 257-65, 297-316. This was the old Board's final report. See also Boston Transcript, 5/25/09, p. 3 and 6/29/09, p. 1. On David Snedden, see Walter Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison, 1967), passim. but especially pp. 101-43; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Reports, 1909-1915, especially 1909-10, pp. 47-55; David Snedden, The Problem of Vocational Education (Boston, 1910).

Throughout the state, the trend toward schooling for job placement before World War I appeared irresistible. Between 1909 and 1915, the five day and ten evening industrial schools with enrollments of 4,700 pupils grew to twenty-four day and thirty-five evening programs, not including agricultural instruction, with more than 8,000 students. Manual training high schools, such as those in Springfield and Boston, which prided themselves on their varied instruction and the preparation for further technical schooling they offered, came under severe criticism for failing to provide practical industrial training, and emerged looking like vocational trade schools. Educators undertook extensive studies to show the increased earnings obtained by trade trained children. Cities like Lowell, finding state funds more readily available for industrial programs than ever before, agreed to establish vocational schools after 1910. In Beverly and Fitchburg, cooperative education classes were undertaken, largely financed by the cities' businessmen, in which children alternated between factory work and the classroom, a scheme one writer referring to Beverly called, the "best example of what a small city can do for industrial education." Boston established its own brand of cooperative schooling by instituting compulsory continuation classes for working children under sixteen, and hiring a Superintendent of Schools in 1912 who had been instrumental in securing industrial education in Cincinnati. Often conducted in business establishments, the continuation classes required four hours attendance weekly, with employers granting full pay for the time in school.

"The tendency is strongly toward cooperative industrial courses for boys who desire to enter industrial occupations," noted Superintendent Franklin Dyer in 1915. "It is generally recognized that industrial education of the cooperative kind should be encouraged. It is the most economical type of industrial education, as manufacturing plants provide the equipment. It gives the boy his industrial training under actual shop conditions."[28]

---

[28] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1908-09, pp. 139-53; ibid.,

Although cooperative schooling never fulfilled Dyer's expectations, the notion that training for particular occupations was a responsibility of public education remained a heritage of the Douglas Commission and its successors. In calling for separate facilities for different kinds of children and highly differentiated school programs, Massachusetts' Commissioner of Education between 1910 and 1916, David Snedden, undoubtedly shocked many in the state who continued to view the common schools as an agency for the co-mingling of social classes and social values. Yet Snedden accurately summarized the trend in the state's educational system when he wrote in his 1914-15 Annual Report: "That the American system of public education must so expand and diversify its organizations as to make extensive and real provision for vocational education is now a foregone conclusion among most students of this subject, whether educators, social economists or business men."[29]

More important, however, than the reorientation of Massachusetts' public schools toward trade classes and shop practices as preparation for the industrial labor market was the revision in ideology which accompanied it. The advocates of manual training had

---

28(con't.)
1909-10, pp. 143-63; ibid., 1910-11, pp. 48-65, 137-88; ibid., 1913-14, pp. 105-34; ibid., 1914-15, pp. 290-93, 300-21; [Abbie Stoddard], "The Study of the Vocational Trend in the Schools of Massachusetts,"[1915-16], pp. 8-21, 34-36, ms. in Women's Educational and Industrial Union Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; George A. Stephens, "hfluence of Trade Education Upon Wages," Journal of Political Economy, 19: 1911, 17-35; Lowell, School Report, 1911, pp. 38-45. The Fitchburg and Beverly experiments were widely commented upon. See Matthew R. McCann, "The Fitchburg Plan of Cooperative Industrial Education," U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, 1913, #50; National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, Part Time and Evening Schools, Bulletin #13, part 3, 1911, pp. 93-122; Arthur D. Dean, The Worker and the State (New York, 1910), pp. 232-46; Frank Leavitt, Examples of Industrial Education (Boston, 1912), pp. 201-22. On developments in Boston, see Boston, School Documents, 1914, #11, pp. 48-55, 65; ibid., 1915, #17, pp. 53, 79-82; Finance Commission of the City of Boston, Report on the Boston School System (Boston, 1911), pp. 55-57; ibid., 1916, pp. 72-126; Charles A. Prosser, A Study of the Boston Mechanics Arts High School (New York, 1915). See also Fall River, School Report, 1913, pp. 51-55 and Worcester, School Report, 1913, pp. 476-77.

[29] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 41-42.

been confused and ambivalent about industrial change. Believing in technological progress, they were uncertain about its social effects, and whether they could contain and control them. Most concerned about life in the city, the failure of socializing institutions there and the deteriorating relationships especially, but by no means exclusively, among the poor and immigrant, they tried through curricularand pedagogical reforms to reconstitute and revivify social values. Not what skills men possessed, but how they used them, less their direct relationship to the industrial economy than their importance to moral decision-making and moral behavior, these were the driving themes of manual education. Trying to balance industrial progress and social stability, manual training opted for the more adequate inculcation of social and moral values. While hand learning was thus particularly applicable to the urban poor, it retained, ambiguously to be sure, a sense of universalism, a concern that all children have a common exposure to common social needs.

The industrial education movement resolved much of the ambiguity in the ideology of manual training. Possessing an abiding faith in industrialization, it saw little if any conflict between technological progress and social stability, refusing to accept as a legitimate question whether the two could be synthesized. Indeed, rather than searching the past for traditional values, it glorified those most closely associated with the industrial present. But even more crucial, industrial education rejected commonality as the basis of common schooling. In a heterogeneous society, manual educators had desperately sought to balance the particular and the universal. Applying the metaphor of the factory, they saw the child as a product and they hoped that all children would go through the same or similar processes of production. Industrial education, however, changed the child from a product to an assembly line worker. Each child was directed toward a different function, his learning part of the specialization necessary for efficient industrial production. All children moving along the assembly line--the processes of common learning--became subordinate to each child standing at a particular point in the line performing a particular function--differentiated learning and separate school programs. Under the impact of industrial education, the public schools revised their notion of commonality, reassessing the nature of schooling in a democratic society, and revising the definition of equality of educational opportunity.[30]

---

[30] The factory metaphor is suggested in Michael Katz, "The Emergence of Bureaucracy in Urban Education: The Boston Case, 1850-1884," History of Education Quarterly, 8:Fall, 1968, 320-21. For a fuller elaboration of the above arguments, see Ch. 7.

## A NOTE ON THE INDUSTRIAL EDUCATION OF GIRLS

The industrial education of females deserves special mention, for it probably caused more confusion among Massachusetts' educators than any other issue related to vocational schooling before World War I.

By comparison, industrial training for males was a straight-forward proposition: the kind of industrial instruction necessary and how it could most efficiently be given. For females, these questions were complicated by the intimate ties hand learning had possessed with the home. In the manual training movement, the perceived breakdown of institutional balance and harmony had been met by providing instruction in principles and social values being neglected and lost. Since females had traditionally learned such values in the home, manual education centered on plain sewing, basic cooking, and other domestic duties. While some educators noted that the training provided had a certain amount of vocational utility, the overwhelming number defined its value in terms of strengthening the home and leading to a more efficient motherhood. This nineteenth century commitment to providing a supplement for home life or, in the case of the poor and immigrant, a surrogate for home training, became accentuated after 1900 when the flood of non-English speaking immigrants and the increasing number of women entering the labor market threatened to overwhelm traditional ideals of family life. Raising what had become a fundamental question among educators and social reformers concerned about the condition of working women, Louise Bosworth asked in 1911, "is the new role degrading woman, antagonizing marriage, and disintegrating family life, or is its influence in these directions elevating?"[31]

---

[31] Louise M. Bosworth, The Living Wage of Women Workers (Philadelphia, 1911), pp. 6-7. A number of studies reported an increasing proportion of females entering the labor market between 1880 and 1910, while an analysis of Worcester, Cambridge, and Somerville in Massachusetts found the proportion of fourteen to sixteen year old girls leaving school to go to work increased between 1910 and 1915. Anna C. Hedges, Wage Worth of School Train-

Whereas the movement away from the principles of work to job training had been accomplished with relative ease for males, once the notion of economic efficiency became established as a goal of public education, concern for home life and motherhood conditioned the responses available for the vocational training of females, and led to a host of complex and often contorted activities. Some of the problems were well summarized by Florence Marshall, one of the country's leading advocates of vocational training for women, and the founder of the Boston Trade School for Girls in 1903.

> While women are being admitted to a larger variety of industries, the minute subdivisions of processes in all kinds of work really means that they are employed more and more in the unskilled occupations which have now become a part of all industries. It is a widening of woman's territory without giving her greater opportunity for advancement. In many of the large factories women become the packers and sorters. In the mills they are doffers and spinners. In the shoe and glove industry they stitch, glue, sew on buttons and perform various other semi-skilled processes. But we do not find them as lasters or cutters of shoes. We do not find them as designers or drawers-in in the mills. We do not find them in the skilled work even in our factories which deal with confectionery and numerous other food products. They have a greater number of chances to work, but fewer chances to become truly skilled workers.

Even more important, however, than the limits placed on occupational mobility, a problem the Douglas Commission and others had suggested went beyond females, was the impact of industrial unskilled labor upon the future of the American home.

> What is the relation of such an occupation to a girl's future home? It determines first of all her social scale and the type of man she will probably marry. Her companionship is limited to men who, like herself, are unskilled workers or who are of shiftless and irresponsible character; this is not alone because of her grade of occupation, but because of her scale of living.

Unskilled industrial labor deadened the intellect, destroyed sensibilities, and led

---

31(con't.)

ing (New York, 1915), p. 1 and Women's Educational and Industrial Union, A Trade School for Girls: A Preliminary Investigation in a Typical Manufacturing City, Worcester, Massachusetts, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin, #17, 1913, pp. 11, 23-24.

to reckless moral behavior. "These stultifying effects incident to women's employment in unskilled work have their obvious bearing upon the home. The majority of girls in this walk of life marry and have homes of their own, but what sort of homes can we expect girls to make when the years of preparation have been spent in this fashion?"[32]

Although Marshall's analysis of the problem was widely accepted, solutions were considerably harder to come by. Marshall suggested training girls for skilled jobs, thereby elevating their occupational status, financial resources, and social surroundings, and thus indirectly strengthening the home. Yet serious questions were raised about the economic efficiency of training girls for trades when most would engage in full time occupation for only short periods before entering upon family life. Others argued that industrial work of any sort was debilitating to the future homemaker, and that any vocational training should immediately benefit the family: dressmaking, cooking, and domestic service. The home thus stood as a constant variable in a succession of attempts at industrial schooling for females, circumscribing and confusing the options open to vocational educators.[33]

No Massachusetts institution was more committed to the resolution of these problems--the balancing of the home and vocation--than the Women's Educational and Industrial Union of Boston. Founded by Brahmins in 1877, the outgrowth of a small discussion group, the Union was part of a movement among the city's upper class females to upgrade their status and cultural opportunities, while engaging in moderate amounts of philanthropic activity.

---

[32] Florence Marshall, "The Industrial Training of Women," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, Industrial Education, pp. 119-26.

[33] Ibid.; Dean, Worker and the State, pp. 61-109; Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education, Annual Report, 1909, pp. 22-23, 24-26; [Stoddard], "Vocational Trend in Massachusetts," pp. 24-32; National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education, Trade Education for Girls, Bulletin #13, part 1, 1911.

Entertainment and lectures on Shakespeare, English literature, and music thus competed with visits to the sick, legal aid to the poor, and the provision of employment for teachers, nurses, stenographers, governesses, and seamstresses for the Union's time. During the last decade and a half of the nineteenth century, however, the Union's focus changed. "Social" became defined less by entertainment and more by service, especially to female industrial workers, while its goals moved from an emphasis on remedial to preventive. After 1900, the Women's Union emerged as one of Massachusetts' most activist reform agencies, agitating for more women in public office, good government, and socially progressive legislation. Simultaneously, it sought more and better job opportunities for the college educated women, while adding to its service functions through the provision of hot lunches for Boston's public school children. Most of the Union's energy and resources, however, were placed in its research and trade training departments.[34]

The Research Department of the WE&IU was undoubtedly the most impressive organization of its kind in Massachusetts and probably in the country. Established in 1906, a few months after the publication of the Douglas Commission report, the new department was committed to organizing research on the Union's multiple concems, propagandizing its findings, and laying the basis for corrective measures. Between 1907, when its first publications appeared, and 1916, the research staff completed studies on labor legislation, the economic and social conditions of working women, vocational opportunities in various Massachusetts cities, and changing conditions in a number of the state's major industries.

---

[34] S. Agnes Donham, "History of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union," 1955, ms. in Union's Papers in Schlesinger Library; "Union News Items," 1911-14, ibid., Mary H. Moran and Julia Pusifer, "Boston's Public School Lunches" [1908], ibid.; Julia Pulsifer, "History and Development of Lunches in High Schools," from Transactions of the Fourth International Congress on School Hygiene, 8/13, ibid. See also material in the Union's papers on its Appointment Bureau.

Seeking to tie these to vocational education, the department also analyzed trade school experiences and part-time schooling. While the research thus covered a wide range of subjects, much of it made apparent the difficulties of securing harmony between the home and vocation, and the implications those difficulties had for industrial education.[35]

One of the most obvious examples revealed by the Research Department of the tensions between vocational opportunities and preparation for home life involved the transition of sewing as manual training into dressmaking as trade instruction. An extension of the basic knowledge provided in the manual training classes, dressmaking seemed an ideal case for the harmony possible between occupational needs and future demands. Varying from semi- to highly-skilled, often involving an excellent clientele, dressmaking's economic value to the family seemed obvious. Moreover, the industry seemed to be changing; traditional apprenticeship and teaching relationships were no longer available in the shop, and it thus appeared an ideal opportunity for trade instruction before entry into the job market. "The women's clothing trade, which has longest retained its domestic character, has within the last two or three decades been brought sharply face to face with the industrial development and organization of the twentieth century," wrote May Allinson in a Women's Union study in 1916. Now requiring capital and credit heretofore unnecessary, small and medium sized shops, where trade instruction had once been given, were collapsing, replaced by larger and more factory-like establishments, no longer willing or capable of providing instruction to youthful workers. With these conditions seeming to offer an excellent opportunity for school-based vocational training, Massachusetts' female trade schools centered on dressmaking instruction. In 1914, of the 2,000 girls who had attended the state's three female trade schools, 62% had been trained as dressmakers, and the proportion then enrolled in the dressmaking course was even higher.[36]

---

[35] May Allinson, "Evolution and History of the Department of Research, 1877-1914;" "Training for Women in Economic Research: Studentships and Fellowships," [1911]; "The Department of Research," [1916]. All are in the Union's Papers. The most widely publicized studies by the Research Department were published as "Studies in Economic Relations of Women," and included: May Allinson, Dressmaking as a Trade for Women in Massachusetts (New York, 1916); ibid., Industrial Experience of Trade School Girls in Massachusetts (Boston, 1917); Bosworth, The Living Wage of Women Workers, (previously cited); Marie Francke, Opportunities for Women in Domestic Service (Philadelphia, 1916); Susan M. Kingsbury, Labor Laws and Their Enforcement (New York, 1911); Lorinda Perry, Millinery as a Trade for Women (New York, 1916). A full list of the Department's studies unpublished as well as published, can be found in the Union's Papers.

Yet a close examination of the dressmaking trade reveals how unrelated was this commitment to conditions in the clothing industry. Desiring trade training which would synthesize the needs of home and vocation, dressmaking's advocates consistently overlooked crucial changes occurring in the latter. Noting, for example, the unemployment and irregularity of work in this highly seasonal occupation, Allinson's analysis obtusely suggested that both could be remedied by a larger supply of more and better trained female workers. In fact, however, the female garment industry was in the process of rapid mechanization and divison of labor. Expert sewers knowledgeable about all phases of the female garment were becoming less and less necessary, replaced by machine workers in an environment which had less resemblance to the dressmaker's shop than to the clothing factory. "The possible supply of girls trained to take up work in a dressmaker's shop," an unpublished study of the trade revealed in 1915, "far exceeds the demand in most localities." Trade training in Worcester, reported the principal of the Girls' Trade School there, was almost worthless in the available job market. "The Boston, Somerville, and Cambridge Trade Schools and the Boston High School of Practical Arts are preparing girls for...Boston shops. In them it is a difficult matter to place girls at $1.00 per day and for the trade school girl there is little or no chance of advancement." The demand for dressmakers in Boston was "dropping off at the rate of 50% in ten years," and, equally portentous, the newly emerging machine jobs were being filled by unskilled immigrant labor. "Dressmaking," one Boston merchant was quoted in 1915, "is a dead industry; you have only to go into our gown department to get the proof."[37]

---

[36] Allinson, Dressmaking, pp. 5-6, 52, 64-65, 68-69; ibid., Industrial Experience, pp. 20-21, 195-99, 209-10.

Dressmaking instruction in the schools after the skills taught had become obsolete in the labor market exposed some of the dilemmas posed by trying to synthesize home and vocational preparation, as well as revealing the broader problems of providing trade training in a rapidly changing industrial society. Dressmaking, however, represented a considerably less pathetic situation than the attempts to invigorate domestic service as a vocation, and the decision by the Women's Educational and Industrial Union to establish a School of Housekeeping to train employer and employed.

Finding their "live-in servant problem" worsening in the 1880's, the ladies of the Union organized a Domestic Service Bureau "to meet the needs of demand and supply." When only moderate success accompanied the opening of the placement agency, the Bureau was reorganized in 1897 as the Domestic Reform League.

> The objects of the League are the scientific and careful consideration of present conditions; the awakening of the interest of women in the largest aspect of the problem; the recognition by the employer that fair conditions should be given for faithful service; and by the employee, that interested and efficient service must be given in exchange for fair wages and just conditions; and the further recognition by both employer and employee that efficiency should be a standard of wages.

Primarily, however, the League hoped to "increase the supply of workers in domestic service by suggesting housework to the industrial wage-earner," while simultaneously preparing working class girls for their future home life.[38]

---

[37] Allinson, Dressmaking, p. 111; Cleo Murtland, "Report on the Factory Needle Industries of Boston," in "Prevocational" folder, North Bennet Street Industrial School Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College; [Stoddard], "Vocational Trend in Massachusetts," pp. 25-27; Women's Educational and Industrial Union, A Trade School for Girls, pp. 38-44, 53-54.

The task soon proved difficult to accomplish. Girls in the Boston area overwhelmingly preferred the factory and store to domestic labor, refusing the isolation and demeaning status associated with full-time housework and claiming larger incomes from other available occupations. The problem, the League concluded, could only be resolved by establishing a School of Housekeeping to teach "efficiency and integrity in work and character in the employee, and an intelligent and responsible relation to the whole question of Domestic Service in the employer." "The School of Housekeeping," declared a pamphlet introducing the "Course for Employees" in 1899, "stands for the belief that Housework is a trade and that the woman on whom the care of a household falls, whether she be employer or employee, should have special training for her work." Housekeeping, the League argued, could no longer be left to feminine inspiration, but was "a science, to be acquired by the employer through study and investigation, -- while the employee must, as in all other trades, serve an apprenticeship before efficiency and an adequate appreciation of the scope and advantages of domestic service, can be attained."[39]

Although the new school received lavish praise in the local press and from such periodicals as Scientific American, Outlook, and Woman's Journal, its attempt to place housekeeping on an industrial trade basis was doomed to failure. Full-time domestic service remained unattractive, and in a seller's market, few prospective domestics felt any pressures to attend a training school. A series of studies all pointed to the same conclusions: domestic service meant longer and more indefinite hours, less free time, more isolation, and fewer vacation privileges than factory and store work, with no substantial improvement in wages. Despite the efforts of the Domestic Reform League to establish service on an equitable contract basis, no evidence suggested that employers accepted that goal or that the life style of the domestic was determined by more than the whim of the employer. "Industrially her position is peculiar," wrote Mary W. Dewson of the Union's Research Department. "She is in the family, but not of it. The service required of her is of the highest importance to the peace and comfort of her employer, but her work is considered inferior in many ways to that of other self-supporting women."[40]

---

[38] Allinson, "Evolution and History of the Research Department," part 3; "History of the Domestic Reform League," 11/03; "Report of the Committee on Domestic Reform: The Effort to Attract the Workers in Shops and Factories to Domestic Service," 4/98. All in Union's Papers.

[39] "Circular to Members of the Domestic Reform League," 8/25/97; School of Housekeeping, Programme of Classes for Employers, 11/97; ibid., Catalogue, 1899; ibid., Course for Employees, 1899-1900. In Union's Papers.

By 1906, the Reform League recognized the need for changes in its approach, without, however, rejecting the notion of training for household duties. Indeed, finding an increasing proportion of foreign versus American born entering domestic service, the League reemphasized the need to prepare women for work in the home, both of those they served and their own. Rather than placement as full-time workers, the League now sought to train day workers and to provide opportunities for service outside the home. Housewives would hire women for a day's work, after which the latter were free to return to the environment of their choice. In addition, through such agencies as the Food Supply Company and Laboratory Kitchen, the League hoped to train workers while supplying fully cooked meals to the homes of its patrons.[41]

---

[40] "Comments of the Press," 1900; "History of the Domestic Reform League," 11/03; Mary W. Dewson, Social Conditions in Domestic Service, 1900, pp. 5-7; "The Effort to Attract the Workers in Shops and Factories to Domestic Service," 1908. In Union's Papers.

[41] Women's Educational and Industrial Union, Trained and Supplementary Workers in Domestic Service, 1906; Domestic Reform League, Bulletin, 1907-1909.

Although these innovations undoubtedly alleviated the servant problem, they failed to achieve their more grandiose goals. Day workers were no more willing to seek trade training than full-time domestics nor employers more willing to provide equity for immigrant women working for them. While an increasing number of services were soon provided outside the home, like the dressmaking trade, they too came to be conducted under assembly line industrial conditions rather than in small shops of semi- and skilled workers.

Developments in dressmaking and domestic service did not constitute the entire story of vocational training for females in Massachusetts. Between 1900 and 1915, the Women's Union, other philanthropic agencies, and, increasingly, public trade and other schools offered instruction in a variety of occupational categories: millinery and hat frame production, cooking, and department store selling. While each raised somewhat different problems, none constituted a significant alternative to the trends and practices already discussed. The activities of the Domestic Reform League and the commitment to dressmaking instruction after job opportunities had ceased to exist, while not entirely without parallels in the industrial education of males, represented cogent examples of the confused status of vocational training for home and job.[42]

---

[42] Florence Marshall, "Shops for Trade Training," The Federal Bulletin, 11/07 and Lucinda W. Prince, "Training for Saleswomen," ibid., 2/08 are discussions of these activities at the Women's Union. Both are in the Union's papers. On Boston Girls Trade School, see Boston, School Documents, 1912 #10, pp. 38-40.

# CHAPTER VII

# VOCATIONALISM AND EQUALITY OF EDUCATIONAL OPPORTUNITY

## I

The ideology and practices of the vocational education movement had momentous consequences for the goals and structure of Massachusetts' system of public education. The arguments that a majority of the system's children were being neglected for a minority, the charges against literary studies, the debates over schooling for particular job placement, and the demands for the immediate applicability of knowledge quickly became a form of gospel among the state's educators. Thrust to the forefront was a sharp dichotomy between culture and vocation, between mental and physical learning, whose boundaries would rarely be bridged in the decades following 1910. As important, vocational education gave structure and definition to an emerging concept of differentiation, the commitment to different kinds of learning based upon different kinds of student characteristics--social and economic backgrounds, perceived desires, needs, and abilities--and upon an amorphous concept of social efficiency which categorized learning by its service to a complex urban-industrial society.

None of this was totally new. Culture and vocation had been in a state of uneasy tension throughout the nineteenth century and had come into partial conflict during the agitation over manual training. Differentiated education was already embodied in the separate English and Latin high schools and within those schools through limited course electives. Yet culture and vocation had rarely been presented as such hostile antagonists, as irreconcilable parties in a war for the allegiance of the citizenry.

While manual educators of a few decades earlier had defended their innovation as being essential for the urban poor, they had nonetheless oscillated between requiring hand learning for all urban dwellers or simply those from particulorly deficient backgrounds. Calling upon the school to restore social values, they expressed uncertainty in emphasizing social distinctions. And, as the vocational educators constantly pointed out, the manual training enthusiasts had justified their demands as a contribution to the cultural integration of American society,not as a means of more effectively categorizing society's participants.[1]

Not all of this was apparent in the years immediately following the Douglas Commission report. The political conflict between the Board of Education and the Commission on Industrial Education tended to shroud the extent to which vocational ideas were already pervading Massachusetts' public education, while the broad implications of the vocational education movement--the irresolvable conflict between culture and vocation and the ever sharpening structure of differentiated education--had been kept ambiguous by the dominant emphasis on secondary and evening school programs. Indeed, trade schooling for the child beyond the age of compulsory attendance helped blur the fundamental issue with which vocational educators had been originally concerned: the school dropout, who rarely completed elementary school and was thus in most cases ineligible either to attend the local trade school or take industrial training courses in high school.

---

[1] A good example of the continuing themes of disrupted harmony, loss of values, fears that urban children were becoming antagonistic to manual labor, and the prominent place of the school in reshaping these developments now combined with a more explicit hostility to literary learning is the Douglas Commission report. See Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education, Report (Boston, 1906), pp. 7-10.

The Kingsbury study had provided some of the rationale for this emphasis on secondary school instruction. Since completion of grammar school and the ages of fourteen and fifteen should theoretically occur in close proximity, and the structure of Massachusetts' industry made industrial schooling most feasible for fourteen to sixteen year olds, secondary trade instruction became a logical approach to the issue of vocational education. Moreover, distinctions in the course of study had already become an established procedure in Massachusetts' high schools, allowing industrial training at secondary school levels, separate or within already existing schools, to be more easily rationalized and implemented. Since most families could and wished to provide economic support for their school children, Kingsbury argued, industrial instruction which was interesting and of direct economic benefit would lead individuals to postpone their school leaving for a year or two.[2]

In practice, Kingsbury's logic proved inadequate. Those who left school at fourteen and fifteen usually failed to complete grammar school requirements. The seeming alternative proposed by the Douglas Commission and the Commission on Industrial Education of industrial training or immediate earnings from unskilled labor never became meaningful choices where children lacked the certification requirements for entering secondary school, had already established a record of failure in school, or found it financially necessary to work. While some educators called for trade school entry at fourteen no matter what grade level had been attained, no consistent effort along these lines was undertaken, and industrial courses continued to miss what had been their original target group: the fourteen and fifteen year old dropout. "The problem of industrial education in the public schools," wrote the editor of Manual Training Magazine in 1908, summarizing the issues involved, "must eventually become the problem of the elementary schools.

---

[2] Ibid., pp. 85-93.

The manual training high school, the technical high school and the vocational high school, as at present conducted, all demand the completion of the traditional elementary school course as a pre-requisite for admission...."Recognizing this situation, Massachusetts' educators turned to prevocational courses and vocational guidance, and in the process revealed the full implications of vocational schooling in the public schools.[3]

## II

Of the many proposals fostered by vocational education, few possessed the potential impact of prevocational schooling. Whatever the dissatisfaction with the elementary schools, most nineteenth century innovators had demanded a continued recognition of common educational goals. Compulsory attendance legislation defined the chronological limits of those demands; where state coercion was applied to school attendance, children should be taught a common syllabus under common conditions. The essentials of citizenship and morality, the creation of homogeneity where heterogeneity existed, the fundamentals of communication and thought, these had been the goals of public schooling, and reform had had to acknowledge those commitments. The separation of educational aims, as had occurred with the mill and factory schools of the 1870's, had almost invariably been rejected.

During the late nineteenth century, manual training had tested but not overthrown the notion of shared learning, and indeed most manual educators would have his skill. Academic work had to be drawn only from "real life" settings, from the industrial experience and future of particular children.[4]

---

[3] Manual Traning Magazine, 10:12/08, 165; Frank M. Leavitt and Edith Brown, Prevocational Education in the Public Schools (Boston, 1915), p. 20; Edward A. Krug, Shaping the American High School (New York, 1964), pp. 237-38. In addition to Kingsbury's data on school dropouts in Massachusetts, see Women's Educational and Industrial Union, A Trade School for Girls: A Preliminary Investigation in a Typical Manufacturing City, Worcester, Massachusetts, U.S. Bureau of Education, Bulletin # 17, 1913, pp. 24, 56 which found more than fifty percent of Worcester's dropouts in 1909-10 not completing elementary school.

These demands that book learning evolve out of industrial concerns, however, were not the most dramatic alterations in elementary schooling required by prevocational education. While neither as clearly articulated nor as extreme, similar demands had previously been involved in the manual training movement and had led to some modifications in curriculum. Prevocationalism's significance lay in its explicit call for the delineation of particular categories of children. There existed, Frank Leavitt and Edith Brown reported, a "prevocational type," individuals for whom the school and the regular curriculum had ceased to have any meaning, children who had fallen behind their normal grade level and would reach the minimum age of compulsory education considerably before they saw any prospects of graduating from elementary school. They were to be found

> stranded or progressing but slowly in the upper elementary grades,...unwilling or unable to apply themselves, and have resisted the attempts of others to drive them to the lifeless task of reading and memorizing a mass of literary material which some one else assures them will do them great ultimate good, but which, so far as they can see, is unrelated to anything in their own lives past, present, or to come. They have finally rebelled, or have acquired a refractory exterior which effectually protects them against the persuasions of their long-suffering teachers.

For the child progressing satisfactorily through the elementary grades with some prospect of entering a secondary school, prevocational instruction was clearly unnecessary. But for those who tended to be "concrete-minded," "seriously retarded," "anti-book" as book learning was customarily undertaken, "physically active," and "individualistic," been horrified at the association of their program with separation in education. While trade schools had pushed segregated schooling and course differentiation further than ever before, they had been addressed to those outside the limits of compulsory schooling, providing in theory and practice an alternative to those who legally could leave school. Although elementary schooling for children under the compulsory attendance laws had been modified by manual activities, and while separate classes for physical defectives and non-English-speaking had become an acknowledged though irregularly implemented feature of public education, differentiation among pupils and their categorization by abilities and career goals had neither been significant nor altered the ideals of common school education. Prevocational schooling in Massachusetts during the decade before World War I, however, would provide an alternative to those ideals and powerfully influence their revision.

---

[4] Leavitt and Brown, Prevocational Education, pp. 2-3, 9, 73-78. This work represents the best summary of the prevocational movement. For other sources, see the discussion below.

Rejecting specific trade training, prevocational educators hoped to revise the last two or three years of the elementary school to allow more flexibility and choice for children whom the schools had failed, children for whom the literary curriculum had ceased to be meaningful. Considered by its advocates analogous to the pre-law and pre-medical courses of the liberal arts college, prevocational schooling was "the type of general education which will lay a better foundation for vocational courses than is commonly laid by the regular school work." Not simply an attempt to bring the shop and manual activities into the elementary school, thus redressing the imbalance between physical and intellectual, prevocationalism demanded a significant revision in the practices and goals of traditional subject matter. Book learning had value only as derived from industrial and vocational needs; mathematics and reading were valuable only as they helped the prospective plumber, carpenter, or factory worker to practice those nearing the age at which they could and would leave elementary school to enter the job market, prevocational education was deemed mandatory.[5]

These then were some of the themes of the prevocational movement: explicit concern with the child who would either not complete elementary school or if he did, would enter the unskilled industrial job market, and a reformulation of the elementary curriculum to introduce basic industrial practices with all academic instruction revolving around those practices. Designed to appeal to and be effective with those the school had traditionally defined as its failures, children for whom schooling as it presently existed had little meaning, prevocational education sought to persuade children to stay in school longer while providing some preparation for industrial employment in case they did not. Unlike the vocational education movement, however, prevocationalism fixed upon the elementary school and depended upon the coercive powers of the state as a foundation for differentiated education: as long as society required these children to attend school, it was under an obligation to provide an education explicitly directed to their future needs.

As had occurred so often in Massachusetts, the initial steps toward implementation were taken in Boston. In May, 1907, the School Committee authorized the Superintendent of Schools " to designate one or more boys' elementary schools in which the course of study may be experimentally modified for the purpose of determining in what way these schools may become more effective in training pupils for industrial pursuits, while at the same time maintaining their efficiency for preparation for high schools." Fifty boys from the incoming sixth grade of the Agassiz School in Jamaica Plain--the highest proportion of dropouts occurred between the sixth and seventh grades--subsequently enrolled in the prevocational class in September, in a program especially suited "for boys who have aptitude for industrial pursuits." At first glance, the prevocational class was only mildly innovative, a moderate expansion of the previously functioning manual training work. The boys received an hour daily of special industrial instruction, and could be enrolled in the course only after their parents requested it. The industrial work involved cardboard box making, an extension of the manual training activities in cardboard construction of the fourth and fifth grades. What made the prevocational class significant, however, was its avowed fundamental principle.

---

[5] Ibid., pp. 4-5, 8, 10, 21-23, 38-39. The word "retardation" was commonly used after 1903 to denote children whose age was beyond their grade level. Thus thirteen and fourteen year olds in the third and fourth grade were considered "retarded," without any reference to their mental abilities. Children who had been sick, were delayed in entering school, non-English speaking who needed elementary school work, and numerous other such categories could be so classified. The word received national publicity in 1909 with the publication of Leonard Ayres' Laggards in Our Schools (New York, 1909), a Russell Sage Foundation study, and again in 1911 when the U.S. Immigration Commission used it to equate slowness in completing school with the number of immigrant children in school. U.S. Immigration Commission, "The Children of Immigrants in the Schools," Reports (Washington, D.C.,1911), vols. 29-33.

> Everything must conform as closely as possible to actual industrial work in real life. The product must be not only useful, but must be needed, and must be put to actual use. It must be something which may be produced in quantities. The method must be practical, and both product and method must be subjected to the same commercial tests, as far as possible, as apply to actual industry.

To assure the latter, the boxes produced replaced those formerly bought by the School Department from commercial sources. To prove the validity of specialization and "the greater economy of employing 'industrial methods,'" each student made one entire box and then participated in construction as a specialized worker: cutter, paster, gluer, assemblyman, inspector, counter.[6]

---

[6] Boston, Documents of the School Committee, 1908, #7, pp. 48-53. (Hereafter cited as Boston, School Documents). The experiment is also discussed in Frank M. Leavitt, Examples of Industrial Education (Boston, 1912), pp. 95-101.

At the end of the first year, Superintendent of Schools Stratton D. Brooks, though hesitant to predict the final results of the Agassiz experiment, recommended its continuation and made clear its implications for the public schools.

> It is hoped that the training received will itself add something to the efficiency of the boys, but it is also hoped that it will so attract them to industrial pursuits that they will seek admission to more complete industrial courses which may be established later.
>
> It is hoped that the experiment may demonstrate that the place to begin industrial training is in the public schools, and that in this way only can our schools be made truly democratic. Until very recently they have offered equal opportunity for all to receive one kind of education, but what will make them democratic is to provide opportunity for all to receive such education as will fit them equally well for their particular life work.[7]

Almost simultaneous with the organization of the Agassiz program, a second prevocational center opened in the North End at the ubiquitous North Bennet Street Industrial School. Continuing the released time policies previously formulated by the Boston School Committee and the North Bennet Street School, and thus structurally different from the Agassiz and later programs, the North End classes nonetheless reflected many of the goals and curricula changes of the prevocational movement. Instruction was first undertaken in September, 1907 in cooperation with the nearby Hancock Grammar, an all female school almost exclusively composed of immigrants or children of immigrants, few of whom graduated. Fifty girls between thirteen and fourteen years of age from the sixth and seventh grades were divided into two classes with each alternating their academic and industrial work between the Hancock School and North Bennet Street in the ratio of two hours to one hour respectively, with the

---

[7] Boston, School Documents, 1908, #7, p. 53.

Industrial School covering the industrial instruction costs. Trying to mediate between vocational needs and preparation for home management, the prevocational classes for girls--sewing, cooking, laundry, housekeeping, and personal hygiene--closely resembled manual training activities, though given more frequently (two hours daily) and at more advanced and more clearly defined levels than heretofore.[8]

Although Superintendent Brooks was less enthusiastic, North Bennett Street's director found the classes a major success. At the end of one year, he informed Boston's public school officials, the girls had "gained an insight into and a liking for real work, and acquired some specific and useful knowledge of the subjects taught and formed ambition for a higher grade of work and of living after school." They had achieved proficiency in their academic subjects equal to or greater than expected, had attained a"greater sense of obligation, of responsibility, of justice and of honest work, together with habits of industry and thrift," and had developed "better poise, and more tidy habits."[9]

More revealing and more innovative, however, was the decision by North Bennet Street in 1910 to request the transfer of academic work to the Industrial School, so that all instruction related to the prevocational program would revolve around the industrial demands of the course.

> In the special industrial class for girls [North Bennet Street's director wrote]... we have attempted to make better provision for the vocational needs of children who will probably leave school early to enter upon industrial and domestic pursuits. To this end the pupils have been given a large amount of industrial work, and their arithmetic has been taught by the industrial teacher with

---

[8] Ibid., pp. 53-54; North Bennet Street Industrial School, Annual Report of the Director, 1909, pp. 17-19, 38-39; ibid., "Report of the Director on the Industrial Work of the Special Class from the Hancock School," pp. 1-6, ms. in North Bennet Street Industrial School Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

[9] Boston, School Documents, 1908, #7, p. 54; North Bennet Street, "Report...on the Industrial Work," pp. 6-9; ibid., Annual Report, 1909, pp. 20-21.

> special reference to the industrial work. Their other academic work has been somewhat abbreviated to fit the schedule, but, as it is taught in the regular public school by a teacher not directly associated with the industrial work, it is necessarily of about the same character as that given to pupils who are being prepared for an extended course in high school.
>
> Industrial training as a subject alone is not right. It leaves the academic work unrelated and uninterpreted. The saving of time which might be effected by close correlation is not secured for the child. Both academic and industrial training need to be given in the same building and under such conditions that a method and not a subject will be developed.

Only in this way could "a system of close correlation of all academic subjects with the industrial" be worked out "so that one will interpret the other, and the pupils...be stimulated to intense interest and effort by the evidence thus offered them that all the work has a real value for later life." Finding the economic arrangement to its satisfaction, and intent upon restructuring the elementary school to offer industrially efficient education to some of its pupils, the Boston School Committee readily accepted the North Bennet Street proposal.[10]

The complete integration of academic and industrial instruction for prevocational girls within the confines of the North Bennet Street School paralleled a similar move a year earlier, when the School Committee had agreed to send boys from the Eliot School, a grammar whose student population, like Hancock's, consisted almost entirely of immigrant children who failed to graduate, to the Industrial School on a full-time basis. Like the transfer of females, the Eliot program was also justified financially--allowing industrial schooling in the North End without expense to the public--and as part of the Boston School Board's commitment to reshaping academic instruction in the elementary school to the vocational future of the children involved. In this sense, the fact that the integration of academic and industrial in the North End occurred at the North Bennet Street School rather than in a public school building was considerably less significant than the more widespread decision by Boston school officials to establish industrially oriented courses for some elementary school children.[11]

---

[10] Ibid., Annual Report, 1910, pp. 21-24.

By 1910, prevocational centers affecting seven Boston elementary schools had been established, with the industrial work--now expanded to include furniture making, sheet metal production, machine work, and printing--increasing as a proportion of academic instruction. Whereas the Agassiz experiment began with five hours a week devoted to industrial practices, a prevocational center opened in 1909 spent between twelve and thirteen hours in shop and mechanical drawing, half the available class time and five times the amount spent on those subjects by the regular elementary pupils in the same school. Five years later, prevocational education for girls existed in nineteen elementary schools, for boys in eight prevocational centers, some drawing students from several school districts. The arguments offered by the North Bennet Street School for academic instruction evolving out of vocational activities had become standard practice. Beyond Boston, while still in its infancy, intensive shop courses for selected elementary school students had either appeared or were in the process of implementation in other Massachusetts communities--Cambridge,

---

[11] Letters from Director, North Bennet Street Industrial School to Stratton D. Brooks, Superintendent of Schools, and other Boston School Officials, 4/22/09, 5/29/11 in "Prevocational"folder, North Bennet Street Papers; North Bennet Street, Annual Report, 1910, pp. 19-21; ibid., 1911, pp. 22-31; ibid., 1912, pp. 21-26.

Beverly, Springfield and Worcester.[12]

Even more important than the specific programs and centers, the ideology underlying prevocationalism had begun to pervade the state's system of public education. Again, developments had gone farthest in Boston. Those who were "retarded academically" and those normal members of the upper elementary grades who would not remain in school after fourteen or graduation, wrote Boston's Assistant Director of Manual Arts in 1913, were to be the recipients of special industrial preparation. "A large proportion of these over-age children," noted Superintendant Franklin Dyer somewhat defensively in that same year, "are neither defective nor less capable than ordinary children. Neither is it true that they are less developed. They are simply different. . . . They are the children who learn best by doing things. . . . The study that will arouse their interest and make them put forth must be accompanied by action, by practical doing,--for they are 'practical-minded.'" One study of prevocational classes in Boston found that the majority of pupils were placed in the special program by teachers. "In thus directing a child the teacher is guided by one or more of three considerations: the pupil's dexterity as shown by his previous manual training work, his inability in regular school subjects, or the economic conditions of his home." In some schools, the prevocational courses were regarded as "adapted only to the mentally inferior," in others as conveying "an idea of direct preparation for life." Continually, as a Women's Educational and Industrial Union study revealed, the "motor-minded" child and the school dropout were made synonymous, and both invariably seemed to come from the poor and working class. Prevocationalism was a means of reaching those "who lack aptitude for ordinary schooling."[13]

---

[12] Boston, School Documents, 1910, #10, pp. 56-78; ibid., 1914, #11, pp. 42-43, 147-54, 178-84; ibid., 1915, #17, pp. 10-11; Cambridge, Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1913, pp. 18-20; ibid., 1914, p. 13. (Hereafter reports of school committees and superintendents of schools will be cited as School Report); Beverly, School Report, 1915, pp. 14-16; Springfield, School Report, 1913, p. 41; ibid., 1914, p. 23; Worcester, School Report, 1912, p. 29; ibid., 1913, pp. 72-73; [Abbie Stoddard], "The Study of the Vocational Trend in the Schools of Massachusetts," [1915-16], pp. 37-42, ms. in Women's Educational and Industrial Union Papers, Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College. For a dissenting view about the trend toward prevocationalism, see New Bedford, School Report, 1914, pp. 36-37.

Prevocationalism did not create differentiated schooling, and segregated classes were not limited to the "motor-minded" and "practical-oriented." By the second decade of the twentieth century, Boston, leading the way but by no means exclusively engaged in such activities, had also established separate elementary school classes for the physically and mentally handicapped, non-Englishing speaking, and particularly bright students. "It is as unjust," wrote one teacher in a rapid advancement class, "for the very bright child to be held back marking time as for the very dull child to be neglected." Prevocationalism, however, had given powerful impetus and ideological substance to the movement for categorization and separation within the common schools, particularly on the basis of failure in academic subjects. "It is obvious that there are many children who have a distaste for book work, and who are unhappy and discontented with their progress in the elementary schools," wrote the Boston School Committee in 1912. "We should recognize and meet the needs of children having strong motor instincts." "Perhaps the most desirable improvement to be made in the elementary schools," the Committee continued, "would be the separation of the normal from other pupils by placing in separate groups or classes those children who differ from the average child." By World War I, Boston's public educators, with others in Massachusetts close behind, had moved toward the institutionalization of an ideology which emphasized categorization and separation, and which defined the needs of one group of school children by their manual aptitudes, failures in school, and economic and social backgrounds.[14]

---

[13] Assistant Director of Manual Arts quoted in Leavitt and Brown, Prevocational Education, p. 45; Boston, School Documents, 1913, #10, pp. 49, 75-76; [Stoddard], "Vocational Trend," pp. 37-38; Women's Educational and Industrial Union, A Trade School for Girls, p. 22; Worcester, School Report, 1911, p. 83. A major study of vocational schooling in the 1920's criticized prevocational education for being largely directed at industrial training for children of the urban poor. Charles A. Prosser and Charles R. Allen, Vocational Education in a Democracy (New York, 1925), p. 144.

## III

The commitments Massachusetts' educators were beginning to make to job training and prevocational instruction before World War I raised obvious questions about the nature of choice: how it was to be accomplished, the alternatives available, and the kinds of instruction most suitable for particular vocations. Trade schooling based upon local industrial needs, the prevocational centers in Boston, the philanthropic activities of the North Bennet Street Industrial School and the Women's Educational and Industrial Union all in some measure sought answers to these questions, emphasizing the importance and gravity of career choices for society and for the individual.

"The most important immediate effect of the movement for industrial education," declared Boston's Superintendent of Schools in 1910, "has been to move forward suddenly the time of choice, and it is this necessity to choose early a definite career that renders desirable a consideration of vocational direction."

---

[14] Boston, School Documents, 1912, #10, pp. 107-09; ibid., 1913, #10, pp. 65-67; ibid., 1914, #11, pp. 42-43; ibid., 1915, #17, p. 11. Ibid., 1913, #10, pp. 47-82 contains a complete description of the special classes for elementary school children in Boston. The thrust of vocational education in the city is summarized in Boston Finance Commission, Report of a Study of Certain Phases of the Public School System of Boston (Boston, 1916), pp. 126-43.

> ...Whether we favor or disapprove, it seems evident that industrial education will go forward...wherein each class of pupils may receive whatever type of elementary industrial instruction the combined wisdom of the citizens, the school committee, and the teachers determine to be best suited to the purpose in hand. The introduction of separate schools will bring upon the American people a new and serious problem; namely, the necessity of an early choice of vocation. Reliable information and competent advice must be furnished, both to children and to adults, showing what vocations are open to children, what conditions prevail in each, and what the rewards of success may be.

Boston, Superintendent Brooks reported, had recognized these needs and was already investigating trade and business conditions in the city, instructing teachers on the techniques of vocational guidance, and cooperating with community service agencies on advising and placement. Of the latter, the Vocation Bureau of Civic Service House had clearly achieved the most prominence.[15]

Founded in 1901 as a social settlement for immigrants in the North End, another in the host of philanthropic activities engaged in by Mrs. Quincy Adams Shaw, Civic Service House was committed to citizenship preparation, a pioneer in evening Americanization classes and Americanization clubs. In 1908, under the prodding of Meyer Bloomfield, the settlement's director, and Frank Parsons, one of Boston's leading social reformers and co-founder of the Breadwinner's College for working men, Mrs. Shaw had agreed to finance a vocational information bureau as a department of Civic Service House. Opened in April, 1908, under Parsons' direction, the Vocation Bureau offered advice to college students and graduates, young businessmen, and especially to high school pupils and working children of high school age during its first year. With branches at the Young Men's Christian Association and the Women's Educational and Industrial Union, early centers of vocational training and advice, the Bureau's mottoes, Parsons' wrote, were "Light, Information, Inspiration, Cooperation."[16]

---

[15] Stratton D. Brooks, "Vocational Guidance in the Boston Schools," in Meyer Bloomfield, editor, Readings in Vocational Guidance (Boston, 1915), pp. 83-91; Boston, School Documents, 1910, #10, pp. 110-17.

Parsons might well have added "Science" to the list, for above all else it was toward the introduction of scientific methods into career choice and employment that he aimed the Bureau. The problems associated with choosing a vocation, Parsons told his youthful advisees, "should be solved in a careful scientific way, with due regard to your aptitudes, abilities, ambitions, resources, and limitations, and the relations of these elements to the conditions of success in different industries." Although he sought to provide specific job advice, assured employers of the advantages to hiring individuals screened by his Bureau, and counseled on improving manners, appearance, intellectual ability, and citizenship, his greatest concern was with the methodology of making career choices. Introducing elaborate interview and personal data collecting techniques, individual job rating schemes, measurements of efficiency and success, and statistical analyses of job earnings and geographic distribution, Parsons was committed to the "business of perfecting the human machinery," and he sought to establish "a bureau provided with every facility that science can devise for the testing of the sense and capacities, and the whole physical, intellectual, and emotional make-up of the child, and with experts trained as carefully for the work as men are trained to-day for medicine and the law."[17]

Parsons did not live long enough to see his proposals fully implemented. Within a year of the Bureau's establishment, he died, penniless and overworked. But even before his death the Bureau was already on its way toward becoming a major force in Boston's educational system, and through that system, influential throughout the country. The close association between Civic Service House and Boston's philanthropic and social elite had combined with the widespread enthusiasm for industrial education to bring an impressive array of notables to the Vocation Bureau's executive committee: A. Lincoln Filene, wealthy businessman, philanthropist, and member of the Commission on Industrial Education; Mary Morton Kehew of the Women's Educational and Industrial Union; J.L. Richards, president of Boston Consolidated Gas; John F. Tobin, president of the Boot and Shoe Workers' Union; and Paul Hanus of Harvard, chairman of the Industrial Education Commission. Effectively using these contacts and propagandizing its activities, the Bureau soon secured a request from the Boston School Committee to offer a plan for vocational guidance in the public schools.[18]

---

[16] Pauline Agassiz Shaw, Tributes Paid to Her Memory (Boston, 1917); Meyer Bloomfield, The Vocational Guidance of Youth (Boston, 1911), pp. 29-30; Frank Parsons, Choosing a Vocation (Boston, 1909), pp. 91-92. On Parsons as a social reformer, see Arthur Mann, Yankee Reformers in an Urban Age (New York, 1966), pp. 126-44. The Vocation Bureau is placed within the perspective of the vocational guidance movement in Beverley Wolf and Ruth B. Barry, "History of the Guidance-Personnel Movement in Education," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955, pp. 39-43 and John M. Brewer, The Vocational Guidance Movement (New York, 1919), pp. 22-32.

[17] Parsons, Choosing a Vocation, pp. 3-4, 96-100, 160, 165,

Submitting its proposals in May, 1909, the Bureau offered to provide a full time vocational counselor who would cooperate with school officials in the counseling of Boston's public school children. It recommended a series of informational meetings and discussions with teachers on the nature of vocational guidance, lectures to elementary school pupils on the vocational choices open to them, and specific training for selected teachers and principals on vocational counseling. The Bureau also urged that full records of all school children through the period of their initial employment be maintained. Within a few weeks, the School Committee accepted the recommendations, and appointed a Committee on Vocational Direction to work with the Bureau in implementing a program for the 1909-10 school year.[19]

---

[18] Bloomfield, Vocational Guidance, pp. 31-32;. John M. Brewer, History of Vocational Guidance (New York, 1942), pp. 59-60.

[19] Boston, School Documents, 1910, #10, pp. 111-12; Bloomfield, Vocational Guidance, pp. 32-34.

The first year's work saw major emphasis placed on stimulating interest and providing information on counseling. Meetings with teachers, headmasters, and parents were held. "Stimulating vocational lectures have been given to thirty of the graduating classes of the elementary schools of Boston," reported the Committee on Vocational Direction, "including all the schools in the more congested parts of the city....The interest and loyal co-operation of many of the leading philanthropic societies...have been secured as well as that of many prominent in the business and professional life of the city and the state. A good beginning has already been made in reviewing books suitable for vocational libraries in the schools." Vocational counselors were appointed in every high school and all but one of the elementary schools, and a data collection system on all students instituted. Particular attention was paid to advising advanced elementary school pupils on high school courses and work opportunities available to them. The Committee also helped select applicants for the high schools of Commerce and Practical Arts on the basis of aptitudes, where heretofore selection had been made by lot or by academic scholarship. Of primary concern was the education of the city's teaching staff.

> Teachers must have a broader outlook upon industrial opportunities for boys and girls. Even those teachers who know their pupils well generally have little acquaintance with industrial conditions. The majority can advise fairly well how to prepare for a profession, while few can tell a boy how to get into a trade, or what the opportunities therein are. In this respect our teachers will need to be more broadly informed regarding social, industrial, and economic problems.

By the end of the year--"a year of beginnings"--the Committee was well satisfied with its work, and recommended an even further expansion of the vocational guidance program.[20]

---

[20] Boston, School Documents, 1910, #10, pp. 112-16, 147-51. The Committee's report is reprinted in Bloomfield, Vocational Guidance, pp. 34-41.

As the Boston schoolmen readily acknowledged, much of the early success of the counseling movement was due to the activities of the Vocation Bureau. A clearing house for information, a major center of research and publication, a mediary between the child, school, and employer, and an advisor to the public school system, the Bureau, under Meyer Bloomfield who had replaced the deceased Parsons in 1909, had become the major force for vocational guidance in Boston, the state, and probably the country. Bloomfield's activities helped place vocational counseling in the forefront of the city's educational concerns, while his writings sought, less successfully, to provide the movement with an ideology of social reform.[21]

An immigrant who had grown up on New York's Lower East Side, then gone to Harvard University, Bloomfield had been directing Civic Service House since its founding in 1901, and had helped Frank Parsons convince Mrs. Shaw to sponsor the vocational counseling department there in 1908. Committed to integrating the slum dweller into American life, Bloomfield saw the Vocation Bureau as an agency for the stimulation of social reform. The ideal conditions for vocational choice, he argued, had been presented by Benjamin Franklin in his autobiography, when Franklin had observed of his father: "He therefore sometimes took me to walk with him, and see joiners, bricklayers, turners, braziers, etc., at their work, that he might observe my inclination, and endeavor to fix it on some trade or other on land." The age of Franklin, however, had changed radically. Parents were now infrequently equipped to discuss vocations. Jobs had become so fragmented that an individual rarely witnessed the entire productive process, while extreme specialization meant that a wrong vocational decision might be insurmountable. The traditional processes of making choices---experience, parental advice, and even chance--were no longer sufficient or adequate.[22]

---

[21] Meyer Bloomfield, Youth, School, and Vocation (Boston, 1915), pp. 39-49, 65-83, 217-20. See also the excerpts from the Bureau's series "Vocations for Boys" in Bloomfield, Readings, pp. 515-41.

Though widespread in any urban-industrial society, these problems were most acute in the urban slum.

> It is in our centres of population, in the apartment and tenement house districts, that the masses of children are to be found. Here is the most need for unfolding the panorama of occupations to the quick intelligence of the young people. Parents here are busy day and night, and family relationships often suffer. The teachers preside over large classes, and these neighborhoods are filled with a crowd of the unskilled, the poorly paid, the unemployed, and the misemployed. It is a place of high lights and deep shadow; and for thousands of children, life opens unpromisingly. Democracy probably still holds out opportunities to the child that can avail himself of them. But the gifted as well as the ungifted live here equally doomed to undeveloping and cheaply paid labor.[23]

For Bloomfield, the tragedies of American life were being played out in the slum. Here children left school before completing the elementary grades: "Thousands drift aimlessly through school, through work, and through life." To them "pleas for interest in work, loyalty, esprit de corps, training, and efficiency fall on barren ground" Products of a "vocational anarchy," they became the "unemployables."

> We have no plan for conserving the talents of the poor; no plan for conserving the resources of the immigrant. Our schools are fettered by routine. Any social experimentation calculated to call forth the gifts of the new people is left to private philanthropy. A large proportion of the children in our cities who leave school for work as soon as the law allows are foreign born or the children of foreign born. Surely the hard-driven parent struggling for a foothold in an alien country must fail as a vocation advisor to his children. The truth is that parents do not tell their children what they should be, but the children tell them what they are going to be.

These, for Bloomfield, were the reasons for and the challenges to vocational guidance, a commitment to ending "the present chaos in the transition from schooling to self-support."[24]

---

[22] Bloomfield, Vocational Guidance, pp. 1-3; "Meyer Bloomfield," Dictionary of American Biography, XXII, 45-46; Davis, Spearheads for Reform, pp. 52-54.

[23] Bloomfield, Vocational Guidance, p. 7.

As his reference to private philanthropy suggested, Bloomfield had become dissatisfied with the public's neglect of its social problems, and he viewed vocational guidance as a means of enlarging the community's responsibilities. Society, through child labor laws, work certificates for youth, health and factory inspection, vocational training courses, and licenses for employment agencies, had already recognized its stake in the protection of its young, but, he argued, it had failed to assume its full responsibility by misunderstanding the obligations of public schooling.

> The public school must remember the fact that it is primarily an educational institution with social aims. What a century of child-welfare effort and experience has taught the friend of working children, the schools can, least of all, afford to ignore. More than any other institution, the school must stand for a high minimum of protection for all children. It is not to the credit of our schools that, on the whole, they have been unaware of a situation which many an employer has known for some time, and this is, the economic uselessness of children from fourteen to sixteen.

The public school, the central agency of the community, had the right and responsibility not simply to provide advice on job opportunities but also to follow its former pupils into their places of work to assure their continued educational growth. In the community's name, it could inquire into the relationships between employer and employed, and through the publication of its findings, influence the vocational choices of individuals and the social conditions of industry.

> What the schools must ask of employers...is at least a revival of the spirit and the motive in what was best in the old apprenticeship system. The employer's contribution to this end is made up of two important elements; he must provide the leisure, through shortened workdays, and give his practical cooperation to the school authorities who are bound to take in hand the drifting or overworked adolescent. Above all else he must cooperate in what might be called the health guidance of the workers.

---

[24] Bloomfield, Readings, p. vi; ibid., Vocational Guidance, pp. 7-8. Bloomfield was a strong supporter of labor exchanges for the efficient channeling of workers to available jobs. Ibid., pp. 66-71.

Those who taught in the schools, Bloomfield considered the supreme "community workers," the individuals most knowledgeable about the aptitudes and abilities of the community's youth. It was thus the teacher and his associates, properly trained and informed, who should be the mediary between the home, child, and occupation, and Bloomfield devoted much of the energy of his Vocation Bureau to sponsoring classes in vocational guidance for classroom instructors.[25]

In practice, Bloomfield recognized that his goals for social reform would have to await an acceptance by the schools of the more limited possibilities of vocational guidance: advice on curriculum and job choices. To provide more time and opportunities for choosing, he suggested increasing compulsory education to age fifteen or sixteen, and recommended that those in need should receive economic assistance in order to complete their schooling. He differentiated between educational guidance to find the right job and education guidance for proper course selection in school, and he warned against a too-ready categorization, "of forcing vocational decisions upon children; of naively adjusting human'pegs' to 'holes;' or of narrowing the range of service open to the fit." Determined to eliminate chance and fantasy from educational and vocational choices, he nonetheless saw vocational guidance as enhancing social mobility by opening up the full options that continued schooling brought. Rejecting "the uncritical individualism of an age that is gone," Bloomfield retained his faith that individuals could succeed in an environment responsive to their needs, especially if the schools accepted their responsibility to assure each child an adequate "start in life."[26]

Although Bloomfield's activities played an important part in establishing vocational counseling in Boston, his broad vision of the reformist role such guidance could play never received more than passing mention. As vocational guidance moved from its origin in the philanthropically based Civic Service House into the public schools, its primary concern became placement in particular educational tracks or particular jobs. "The problem of vocational guidance in the elementary schools," wrote Franklin Dyer, Superintendent of the Boston Schools in 1915, "is gradually resolving itself into the choice of the proper high schools for the student to attend." The new Department of Vocational Guidance became primarily concerned with helping parents choose among the differentiated course offerings of the seventh and eighth grades, as the basis for advancement into the more specialized high schools. In the high schools, guidance became a way of convincing children to remain in school or advising them on the best subjects to prepare for work. Whereas Bloomfield had cautioned against placing much faith in psychological testing as a means of determining aptitudes and interests, Boston established a Department of Educational Investigation and Measurement in 1913 to test, among other things, the "establishment of standards of achievement on the part of children and teachers that would form definite ideals of accomplishment in different subjects and grades." Although still in its incipient stages, educational testing--the categorization of students and teachers, the establishment of standards, varied to meet the economic and social backgrounds of youth, and the objective measurement of results--was in the process of being substituted for the social reform of industrial life that Bloomfield had sought to make the ideal of vocational guidance.[27]

---

[25] Bloomfield, "School and the Start in Life," in Readings, pp. 325, 714-19; ibid., Youth, School, and Vocation, pp. 24-26, 151; ibid., Vocational Guidance, pp. 22-24, 47-64, 72, 86, 100, 114-16.

[26] Ibid., Youth School, and Vocation, pp. 28-29, 57-59, 149-51, 158-70; ibid., Readings, p. v; ibid., Vocational Guidance, pp. 102-03, 109-10.

---

[27] Boston, *School Documents*, 1915, #17, pp. 14-15, 28-29, 37-42; *ibid.*, 1911, #14, pp. 32-50; *ibid.*, 1913, #10, pp. 29-32; Frank W. Ballou, "Educational Standards and Educational Measurement," *ibid.*, 1914, #10; Bloomfield, *Vocational Guidance*, p. 94. An excellent example of the trend emerging in vocational guidance toward the categorization of students through educational measurement and testing, usually to distinguish

## IV

By 1915, the lines of the prevocational and vocational guidance movements in Boston had been formed, and were spreading to other parts of the state. Prevocationalism had established the concept of differentiated schooling for children under the compulsory education laws, a concept receiving structural definition in the movement for "intermediate" and junior high schools. Vocational guidance which had initially sought to rationalize educational and career choices, while revising the relationship between work and schooling was rapidly losing its commitment to the broader goals of social and industrial reform, already merging with psychological testing and intelligence measurement to categorize students as its predominant concern. School counseling was becoming a means of determining aptitudes and capabilities, a way of objectively identifying those children who were "manually motivated,"and thus belonged in courses preparatory to industrial labor. Although the institutionalization of these trends remained incomplete before World War I, even in Boston where it had gone the farthest, the tendencies had become clear. Additionally, an ideology associated with vocationalism had emerged which sought to redefine the goals of schooling in terms of equality of educational opportunity and efficient social service.[28]

Defined in terms of providing service to society, vocational education meant the in-school training of efficient industrial workers for economic growth. By teaching precision in manual work, knowledge of industrial processes, and particular job skills, all summarized

---

27(cont.)
prevocational or manual students from academic students, can be found in a joint arrangement worked out between the North Bennet Street Industrial School and the Somerville, Massachusetts public school system. Expanding upon work started before World War I, the former conducted a series of psychological and aptitude tests in the Somerville schools between 1919 and 1922 in order to differentiate "mind workers" from "hand workers." See the Vocational Guidance" and "Psychological Testing" folders in the North Bennet Street Industrial School's Papers.

[28] Boston, School Documents, 1915, #17, pp. 28-29, 37-38, 84-118.

as "job intelligence," vocational schooling seemed a peculiarly well-suited adaptation of the school to the needs of a modern industrial society. Educational differentiation and vocational guidance were means to the more efficient productivity of these future industrial workers by ascertaining who they were, separating and introducing them to school programs and job possibilities they appeared most likely to succeed at. Vocationalism called for specialization in an increasingly specialized age, particularism in a society seeming to demand particular skills. For the school as an institution, the categorization of students, the separation of educational programs outside of and within individual schools, and the measurement of input through aptitude tests and output by job and higher educational placement made the processes of organization and structure--how administration could most effectively occur--the dominant concern of school officials. A smoothly functioning educational plant meant more clearly defined goals, increased productivity, and a more efficient institution. Vocational education, by seeking to integrate its products with the apparent demands of the economy, allowed the schools to show efficiency in production, and helped make immediate service a primary goal of public education.[29]

The industrial education movement also sought to democratize the schools by bringing into them individuals--the poor, the immigrant, the "manually" motivated, the dropout--who had hitherto been outsiders. By making vocational preparation--now defined to include manual occupations--and the economic welfare of the individual primary goals of public schooling, industrial education helped revise traditional notions of intelligence and educational aptitude, and called upon the school to respond to individual needs. "It is this fair dealing with all kinds of work and talent that the new democratic spirit in education invokes," wrote Henry Suzzalo of Columbia Teachers College, asserting the new democracy of vocationalism. "In recent years the recognition of differences among children has resulted in many modifications in education," began the 1910 Annual Report of Boston's Superintendent of Schools.

---

[29] These themes have been enumerated in a number of sources. On industrial efficiency as an aspect of vocational education by two leading proponents, both of whom first became involved in industrial education while in Massachusetts, see Prosser and Allen, Vocational Education, pp. 19-45, 368-81. See also Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago, 1962); Daniel Horowitz, "Response to Industrialism," unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1966, pp. 194-95; Krug, Shaping the American High School pp. 273-83.

> Educators have endeavored to determine what differences exist and in what way the educational machinery needs to be modified in order best to promote the welfare of each individual pupil. Because children differ in mental alertness, flexible systems of promotion have been devised...Because children differ in moral responsibility, standards of discipline have been revised, additional efforts to establish moral stability and to inculcate moral principles have been made...Because children differ in vocational aim, the schools are now being reorganized for the purpose of providing an education for each child that will best fit him for his future position in life. Industrial education is therefore but an additional result of the general effort to determine the differences among children and to adapt education to the individual needs of the children.

Equality of educational opportunity thus became defined by differentiated schooling, common goals replaced by separate aims.

> It is popularly held that "all men are created free and equal" They are free in this country, and equal in the sight of God, but so far as likes and dislikes, aptitudes and limitations, powers and weaknesses are concerned, there are not two individuals alike. Our entire educational system has, however, been established and built up on the basis that these unlike persons could be dealt with in large numbers throughout the greater part of their school career, and only be segregated into small sections when well advanced in their educational life. The Vocational Bureau [and by extension, vocational education] is operated on the opposite assumption, namely: That persons are not alike, and that each has his own peculiarities which should be studied and an effort made to discover that line of human endeavor in which each may most reasonably hope to succeed.[30]

---

[30] Suzzallo's introduction to Bloomfield, Youth, School and Vocation, pp. vii-xi; Boston, School Documents, 1910, #10, pp. 5-6; "Choosing a Career," Boston Common, 7/16/10, p. 19.

While the ideology of equality of educational opportunity demanded responsiveness to individual needs, in practice, however, it meant shaping the school to categories of children. "In this discussion," declared David Snedden two years before he became Commissioner of Education in Massachusetts, "we assume (a) that American education aims to be democratic; that it therefore (b) seeks to give, within their personal and social capacity, equal opportunities to all; and that (c) equality of opportunity can only be secured by recognition of differences which, theoretically individual, may nevertheless, for practical purposes, be regarded as characterizing distinguishable groups of children." These groups, Snedden continued, should be based upon "(a) native capacity, including strong interests and tastes; (b) economic conditions of the family and its capacity to support the child during the period of its higher education; and (c) probable educational [vocational] destination."[31]

Although an extreme advocate of segregation in education, the educator most willing to confuse educational aptitude with social background and probable economic destination, Snedden's ready association of industrial education with children who failed in school and who had little alternative to leaving school for industrial employment, nevertheless, soon came to pervade educational thought. Critiques of fantasy in education, the lack of realism among the poor and working class--a keynote in the origins of the Vocation Bureau--the chastizement of manual laborers for looking wistfully to the professions as a possibility for their children, these became the terms upon which discussions of equality of educational opportunity were built. Increasingly, a note of predetermination entered the rhetoric and practices of Massachusetts' schoolmen. Those destined for industrial employment were those who came from backgrounds of such employment. Differentiated education, wrote Joseph Lee of the Boston School Committee in 1910, assured the taking of "different roads that different temperaments must follow to reach their social destiny." It was this sense of categorization, the feeling that particular kinds of children belonged in particular school programs, and the association of those categories with social background and probable future destinations which became, above all else, the legacy of vocational education.[32]

---

[31] David Snedden, "Differences Among Varying Groups of Children Should be Recognized; and the Period at Which This Recognition Takes Place May Rationally Constitute the Beginnings of Secondary Education," Manual Training Magazine, 10: 10/08, 1-2. On Snedden's commitment to separate schooling for different categories of children, see Walter Drost, David Snedden and Education for Social Efficiency (Madison, 1967), pp. 158, 165-66, 168, 182-90, 196-98; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 36-38, 42-44.

---

[32] Joseph Lee, "The School Situation," Boston Common, 1:5/14/10, 17; Boston, School Documents, 1912, #10, p. 83; Brewer, Vocational Guidance Movement, p. 105; Wolf and Barry, "History of the Guidance-Personnel Movement," pp. 53-61, 69-74.

# CHAPTER VIII

# THE QUEST FOR CITIZENSHIP

## I

"It is evident that there is a revival of an earnest spirit of patriotic Americanism throughout the land," resolved the National Education Association in 1892. "It is the result of various causes. Foremost among these is the work so wisely carried out by patriotic schoolmasters. Nowhere is the new spirit of Americanism more active than in our public schools." In a time of patriotic fervor, echoed Francis Bellamy, editor of *Youth's Companion,* the teacher "holds the future of American politics." The sentiments were hardly novel. Individuals as diverse as Thomas Jefferson and Noah Webster had earlier called upon the common school to solidify the American experiment in representative government. In mid-nineteenth century Massachusetts, Horace Mann had articulated an elaborate rationale for the public support of schools as the basis of a republic, hoping to create through schooling a sense of community among the citizenry and between the generations. By the end of the century, this tie between democracy and a common education had become an article of faith, marred, but paradoxically also strengthened, only by the specter of parochialism and privatism among the alien and affluent. "As the colonies, and later the states have grown more and more democratic in spirit and in policy," Boston's Superintendent of Schools Edwin Seaver told a National Education Association audience in 1898, "so have free schools been multiplied and improved, in order that a good education might be brought within easy reach of all the people. It early became an accepted maxim that every child had a right to an education."

> But this was not for the child's sake alone. The child's right to an education was, more properly speaking, the community's right

> that the child be educated. The right to an education rests not only on the relation of child to parent, but largely also on the relation of the child to the state. The child is soon to become a free citizen of a free state. He is to be a sovereign; and much will depend on his being intelligent and honest. His right to an education, therefore, has been embodied in the fundamental laws of our states as part of that security for free men and free institutions which those laws are designed to give.

The public schools, affirmed another Association speaker, were the "digestive organs" of American society, "the most American of all American institutions," as essential to the permanence of the government as is the stomach to the life of the human body." "The American school is the salvation of the American republic."[1]

Yet if the rhetoric of American education reaffirmed commitments made before the Civil War, it spoke from a dramatically altered perspective. Ante-bellum school reformers had been engaged in a battle for community support in which victory was always uncertain. A half century later, the legitimacy of public education could no longer be denied. Sanctified by compulsory attendance legislation and a growing faith in the power of formal educational institutions to shape the mind, the public school--criticized for its archaic methods and irrelevant curriculum, bending under the load society placed upon it, inadequately financed, and occasionally threatened by the resulting hostilities--stood, nonetheless, as a central agency through which the community expressed its will. Whereas parents and children had once chosen attendance or non-attendance, now they decided upon which school to attend and for how long. By the end of the nineteenth century, all educational conflict--curriculum reform versus traditionalism, parochial versus public, vocational versus literary--assumed this legitimacy and the permanence of public education. And, in most cases, participants looked to the school to enlarge its social responsibilities.[2]

---

[1] National Education Association, Journal of Proceedings and Addresses, 1892, p. 23; Francis Bellamy, "Americanism in the Public Schools," ibid., pp. 61-67; Edwin P. Seaver, "Democracy and Education," ibid., 1898, p. 250; H.M. James in ibid., 1886, pp. 529-31; E.O. Vaille, "Teaching Current Events in School," ibid., 1892, p. 142. See also Lawrence A. Cremin, The American Common School: An Historic Conception (New York, 1951); ibid., The Transformation of the School (New York, 1961), pp. 9-11. On the ideological relationship between public education and democracy, see Rush Welter, Public Education and Democratic Thought in America (New York, 1962).

Indeed, the notion of responsibility had brought about the most striking changes in the post-bellum decades. Early school reformers called upon the schools to resolve social problems through the inculcation of common moral values and basic intellectual skills. Ambivalent about the relationship between the school and the social environment, they remained optimistic that the two could work in harmony, the school building upon the values initiated in the family and community outside. Where hostile environments--in the city and among immigrant newcomers--threatened the delicate balance between school and society, ante-bellum educators retained their faith that such conditions were temporary and that the school, once widely accepted, could overcome such adversities. They continued to believe that the mixing of children together in a classroom, providing them with the fundamentals of literacy and morality, would receive enough external reinforcement to assure the homogeneity and cohesion necessary for the functioning of a democratic society.[3]

In the last decades of the nineteenth century, however, fears about the social environment, sporadically manifested before the Civil War, became the dominant motif of American educational debates. Schools seemed to exist in a society threatened at every moment by social sin. Public infidelity, labor agitation, conspicuous consumption, slum living, Roman Catholic separatism, Mormon polygamy, political chicanery, problems in themselves, reflected a fundamental corruption of the body politic, hastened and abetted by the bewildering pace of technological and social change. In most cities, the experience of communal living seemed a direct threat to the homogeneity of values and behavior patterns that had become the raison d'etre of the public school. It was this fear of a society being overwhelmed by the social environment, now combined with the burdens of establishment placed upon the school as a community institution, which gave shape to the activities of the "patriotic schoolmaster" and the "revival of an earnest spirit of patriotic Americanism throughout the land." No longer able to count upon the external environment for responsible decision making, committed to the State as the basis of civilization, American schoolmen began to rework their definitions of citizenship, moving from a faith in literacy and broad moral values to an explication of behavior and patriotism. In a desperate search for symbols of unity, they made national holidays and the flag fundamental ingredients of the educational process. But even more substantial, in Massachusetts, these tendencies received their most striking manifestation in the development of the public evening schools and the teaching of history.[4]

---

[2] For suggestive comments on the relationship between the commitment to formal and compulsory education institutions and alternatives to the public schools, see Robert D. Cross, "Origins of Catholic Parochial Schools in America," American Benedictine Review, 16: June, 1965, 194-209.

[3] Cremin, The American Common School, but see also Michael Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform (Cambridge, 1968).

---

[4] Oscar Handlin, *John Dewey's Challenge to Education* (New York, 1959), pp. 19, 23-27. Any gathering of educators or collection of essays brought forth arguments similar to those cited above. See, for example, A.D. Mayo, "Object Lessons in Moral Instruction in the Common Schools," National Education Association, *Proceedings,* 1880, pp. 6-17; N.A. Calkins in *ibid.*, 1886, p. 75; A.E. Winship, "The Educational Cure of Mormonism," *ibid.*, 1886, pp. 117-26; Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1883-84, pp. 125-30; A.E. Winship, "The School-House in American Development," *Education,* 6:3/86, 387-93; "Symposium on Temperance Instruction in the Public Schools," *Journal of Education,* 24: 9/30/86, 207-16. On the flag mania in Massachusetts, see *Journal of Education,* 30: 12/26/89, 408; *ibid.*, 33: 6/4/91, 360; *ibid.*, 42: 10/10/95, 243; *ibid.*, 45: 6/3/97, 354-55.

## II

To some observers of ante-bellum Massachusetts, it must have seemed as if the state's adult population had gone on a learning binge. New England villagers, Boston sophisticates, small town artisans, and urban workingmen, all were showing up to listen to and applaud lectures by some of the country's and region's leading personages. Emerson, Edward Everett, Daniel Webster, Catharine Ward Beecher, Francis Wayland, and numerous others moved along the lyceum circuit offering cultural sustenance, exposure to scholarship and politics, and communal entertainment. Artisans and mechanics organized libraries, discussion groups, and lectures to introduce themselves to advanced scientific techniques, political organization, and the varied pleasures of group recreation. Philantrhopists and clergy similarly produced programs designed both to stimulate moral behavior and social success. In Boston, John Lowell, Jr. established the Lowell Institute, the nation's most prominent lecture center, to assure a permanent place for self improvement in the Boston community, while other Bostonians founded the city's Public Library in 1852 to expand knowledge among the adult population. Incorporating highly diversified goals--knowledge for pleasure and material gain, morality, social recreation, and community harmony--through a multiplicity of means, adult education in ante-bellum Massachusetts attracted a broad range of participants in activities which defied simple categorization.[5]

Among these activities, formal schooling--classroom learning -- held a limited place. The evening classes that had emerged during the colonial period as surrogates to the master's non-vocational obligations under the apprenticeship contract, had gradually expanded their curriculum from basic instruction in literacy and arithmetic to include more directly practical and vocational subject matter. With the withering of the apprenticeship system during the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries, however, and the extension of day schooling to ever increasing numbers of children, evening classes had turned their attention toward older youth and adults, those beyond the age of required schooling, and like the other phases of ante-bellum adult education, provided a modicum of vocational instruction, lessons in the common morality, and some introduction to culture, often but not always, under the same roof. Simultaneously, philanthropic and church agencies became involved in attempts to uplift the poor and immigrant, individuals whose environment and life styles seemed to preclude social advancement, literacy, or the inculcation of moral values. The need for evening schools commented the Boston School Committee on ante-bellum trends, "was observed many years ago, especially by persons engaged in charitable works among the indigent classes; and to meet this want, free evening schools for very elementary instruction were opened under the auspices of two or three charitable or religious organizations." Reflecting similar concerns, a joint committee of Lawrence's religious denominations, save for the Catholics, opened a free evening school in 1861 conducted by the City Mission, where the rudiments of literacy, arithmetic, and some vocational training were introduced in an environment deemed morally safe. Believing that even the lowest could improve himself and could learn at any age, assuming that knowledge could be put to economic advantage and thus possessed a social utility, and hoping to provide a secure atmosphere within which such learning could occur, the architects of the evening school adopted the heterogeneous goals of the pre-Civil War adult education movement, placing themselves securely within its voluntaristic traditions.[6]

---

[5] Sidney Jackson, "Some Ancestors of the 'extension course,' "New England Quarterly, 14: 9/1941, 505-18; Carl Bode, The American Lyceum (New York, 1956), chs. 4, 11; C. Hartley Grattan, editor, American Ideas About Adult Education, 1710-1951 (New York, 1959), pp. 20-47.

---

[6] Boston Annual Report of the School Committee and Superintendent of Schools, 1888, p. 61; Katz, The Irony of Early School Reform, pp. 110-11; Roberty Seybolt, Evening Schools in Colonial America (Urbana, 1925), pp. 9-12, 21-32; Bernard Bailyn, Education in the

Even before the War, however, Massachusetts had moved to differentiate formal schooling for adults and out-of-school youth from the philanthropic and self-supporting activities of the lyceum, mechanics' institutes, and charity classes. In 1847, the state legislature allowed the use of public funds for evening classes, thereby fostering some independence from private and philanthropic sources. A decade later , the legislature went even further, authorizing the use of school funds to finance evening instruction, placing all such classes under the direct responsibility of local school committees. Although the 1857 legislation had little immediate impact, it did legitimize evening schools as public education, and in the late 1860's cities like Boston, Cambridge, and Lowell appropriated funds from their regular school budgets to finance public evening classes. In 1870, the Lawrence School Committee, participating in a widening trend, similarly agreed to a City Mission request that it take over the Mission's decade old free evening school.[7]

The movement to place formal evening instruction under the auspices of the public schools was further strengthened in 1869 and 1870 by two distinctive and sharply differentiated legislative actions. Concerned about the discrepancy between the ages at which most children left school and the 1857 requirement that admission to evening classes be limited to those over fifteen, the legislature, in 1869, lowered the admittance age to twelve. Experience had shown, Secretary of the State Board of Education Joseph White commented, "that there is found, in the larger towns and cities especially, a considerable number of young children extremely poor, whose daily earnings are absolutely necessary

---

6 (cont.)
Forming of American Society (New York, 1960), pp. 32-33. (Hereafter all annual reports of school committees and superintendents of schools will be cited as School Report.)

[7] Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves of the General Court, 1847, ch. 137; ibid., 1857, ch. 189; Boston, School Report, 1869, pp. 177-78; Lowell, School Report, 1869, pp. 46-47; ibid., 1899, pp. 57-58; Lawrence, School Report, 1870, pp. 15-16; ibid., pp. 30-33; Cambridge, School Report, 1890, p. 37; Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Fourth Annual Report, [1869-70], p. lxi.

to keep the family from starvation or the almshouse. That these may not be deprived of all educational privileges, the amendment fixes the limit of age at which they may attend the Evening School at twelve years." Making explicit the state's concern with improving literacy, providing the tools through which communication and social responsibility could occur, and seeing evening classes as supplements to inadequate earlier education, the evening schools quickly adopted the elementary day school curriculum as the basis of their teaching. "The advantages to be derived from free evening schools are peculiarly marked in a city like ours," concluded Lowell's Committee on Evening Schools in 1876, "where so large a proportion of the young are engaged during the day in manual labor, and who are consequently deprived of the privileges afforded by our day schools." The boot and shoe industry, Lynn's School Committee similarly remarked, attracted children from the day schools "at an early age," thus making "the maintenance of first class evening schools...of the utmost importance." The consensus that evening schools should be patterned after day programs for those unable to attend the latter was aptly summarized by the Evening Schools Committee of the Boston School Board in 1881:

> There must always be in a city like ours a large number of persons, who, while they most need an education, are least able to avail themselves of the privilege of attending school. Poverty and the necessity for their daily labor compel many to leave school without even the rudiments of a good education, and prevent others who have never enjoyed any school advantages from doing so. The only time available for self improvement is in the evening. Hence the necessity for evening schools, and the reason for their maintenance and support.[8]

---

[8] Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves, 1869, ch. 305; Massachusetts Board of Education, Thirty-Third Annual Report, [1868-69], p. 110; Lowell, School Report, 1873, pp. 13-14; ibid., 1876, p. 45; Lynn, School Report, 1883, pp. 11-13; Boston, Documents of the School Committee, 1881, #20, pp. 3-4. (Hereafter cited as Boston, School Documents.) See also Lawrence, School Report, 1877, p. 28; New Bedford, School Report, 1880, pp. 37-38; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1885-86, p. 15.

While the 1869 legislation focused on the need for a literate population, the best means of assuring socially responsible citizenship, the industrial drawing act of 1870 reinforced a considerably different theme in the evening school movement, involving the state in the financing of vocational training. Largely through the efforts of a businessmen-manufacturers' coalition, the state legislature required every city and town of more than 10,000 inhabitants to offer evening instruction in mechanical drawing, hoping thereby to advance the state's economic progress and the individual worker's success. "The free evening drawing schools," wrote a committee of the Boston School Board, "were established for mechanics and artisans wishing to make up deficiencies in their education, which...seriously interfere with their success in life. Skilled labor commands high wages and skilled labor is what these schools should produce." Within a few years, most of the state's large cities had opened drawing schools, attracting a solid base of semi-skilled and lower white collar workers. In some cases, as in Worcester, the commitment was extensive, developing out of previously functioning self-improvement and technical instruction courses. In other cities, the mechanical drawing schools seem to have appeared for the first time as direct responses to the state legislation, theoretically offering practical instruction in industrial design.[9]

---

[9] Committee on Music and Drawing of the Boston School Committee quoted in Isaac E. Clarke, Art and Industry (U.S. Senate, Executive Documents), 46th Congress, second session, vol. 7, part 1, 257-58; Worcester, School Report, 1870, pp. 31-36; ibid., 1871, pp. 21-25; ibid., 1884, pp. 33-34; Springfield, School Report, 1870, p. 16. The industrial drawing classes' role in actually providing either social mobility or economic efficiency is difficult to assess. The readily available evidence is mixed. The schools attracted a small but steady supply of semi-skilled laborers, clerks, carpenters, mechanics, and even teachers through to the end of the nineteenth century, suggesting a continuing faith in the opportunities being offered there. In a city like Springfield, the work of the schools received commendation all during the 1870's and 1880's. After the initial flush of enthusiasm, however, the drawing classes in most cities failed to continue their early growth, and settled into a rather static record of attendance. The manufacturers and businessmen most responsible for the 1870 legislation do not appear to have continued their activities on behalf of industrial drawing after the early 1870's, probably reflecting a recognition that

The 1869 statute to open evening classes to any above the age of twelve and the 1870 legislation requiring industrial drawing classes in Massachusetts' larger cities combined the two significant themes of evening education--literacy and vocationalism--now, however, centering them in public supported institutions. By the mid 1870's, thirty-two cities and towns in Massachusetts were expending between $65,000 and $70,000 annually on night classes, enrolling around 16,000 individuals, most of whom were attending the drawing classes, Yet if the evening schools had thus become an acknowledged feature of public education in the state before 1880, they remained the system's step-sisters. In the early 1880's,with interest in drawing classes declining, enrollment dropped to under 12,000 students, expenditures to less than $60,000 annually. "The Evening School," complained Lynn's Superintendent of Schools in 1881, "seems to have become a thing of the past with us. On inquiry, I found the impression prevailing that there was more in the name of keeping an Evening School than in any advantage secured to a sufficient number of attendants, to warrant the trouble and the expense." Where schools were maintained, attendance rarely averaged more than fifty percent of enrollment, while the registration itself was deceptive since many came a few times and never returned. The situation in Cambridge, one of the first cities to provide public supported evening classes, became so bad in 1879 that the School Committee moved to close the schools, only relenting in one

---

9 (cont.)
their economic success hardly depended upon such instruction. Moreover, few pupils appear to have actually become draughtsmen, the goal which the classes had originally sought. Unfortunately, until individual career lines of workers who received such training is undertaken, questions about the social and individual utility of evening industrial drawing classes must remain unanswered. On the background to the 1870 Act and its implementation, see above pp. 122-36. The best way of relating the evening drawing classes to a particular school system is to follow the annual school reports. See, e.g., Springfield, School Reports, 1873, pp. 29-30; 1875, pp. 9-10; 1877, p. 23; 1878, pp. 19-20; 1881, p. 31; 1887, pp. 49-50. A representative example of the occupational categories attending the drawing classes is Haverhill, School Report, 1885, p. 54. See also, George H. Bartlett, "Free Industrial Evening Drawing Schools--Their Importance," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1888, pp. 607-14.

portion of the city when a petition of forty residents requested their continuation.[10]

This acceptance with reluctance, the often tenuous condition of evening classes, had many manifestations, but one of the most obvious was the inadequate facilities provided by local school systems. Describing a not atypical situation, Lowell's Committee on Evening Schools wrote in 1876: "A basement, heated by steam pipes passing overhead, with little or no ventilation, with a large number of gas-lights rapidly consuming the oxygen of a room, filled with boys and girls none too clean, at the end of an hour presents an atmosphere that flavors strongly of a pest-house." Continuing the same theme, seven years later, the Secretary of the State Board of Education chastized communities for failing to provide suitable accommodations, proper supplies, or competent instructors. "With the ill-lighted and cheerless quarters afforded evening schools, which were taught by teachers, of whom many were rejected from day school service, and equipped with condemned supplies, what could be expected but the results of record?"[11]

In an attempt to resolve the most obvious deficiencies in the system--attendance, facilities, and teaching staff--school committees resorted to a variety of expedients. Worcester, Springfield, and Boston imposed a one to two dollar deposit on all evening school enrollees, returnable on condition of good behavior and regular attendance. Springfield and Boston additionally allowed a limited number of absences before expulsion took place. But while the fee system might insure regular attendance among those determined to attend, it risked losing others uncertain about their regularity and did nothing to attract students. More to the point was the decision to allow evening classes entry into the regular day school-classrooms, thus providing at least as much light, ventilation, and accommodations--within the limits of classrooms built for children--as was furnished the other parts of the public school system, a crucial action since the social and economic background of the evening schools non-vocational pupils had already singled them out as a unique category. A number of cities began to allow day school teachers to instruct at night, thereby upgrading the instructional corps from teaching rejects or transients to regular staff members. In addition, the legislature took a major step in 1883 by making evening classes for twelve year olds and above in "orthography, reading, writing, geography, arithmetic, drawing, United States history and good behavior," mandatory in all cities and towns of more than 10,000 inhabitants.[12]

---

[10] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1902-03, p. 92; ibid., 1890-91, p. 75; Lynn, School Report, 1880-81, p. 46; Cambridge, School Report, 1879, pp. 7-8; Haverhill, School Report, 1886, p. 31

[11] Lowell, School Report, 1876, p. 46; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1883-84, pp. 18-19.

Although the 1883 legislation pronounced evening schools an integral and required feature of urban public education, its ignoring of vocational training--drawing was included as a means of discipliningaccuracy and taste-- made explicit the distinctions between the evening elementary schools and evening vocational schools, and focused the state's commitment almost exclusively on the former. The statute's immediate impact, however, is difficult to determine. Despite the absence of any enforcement provision, expenditures for evening classes in the state which had hovered around $60,000 prior to its passage jumped to $72,000 in 1883-84, and $90,000 a year later. Nevertheless, changes in individual cities were inconsistent. In Springfield, where school officials had expressed satisfaction with the evening program for more than a decade, the 1883 legislation produced no significant increase in enrollment. Lowell, on the other hand, saw its registration go from around 1,500 to more than 2,000 within two years. New Bedford's Superintendent of Schools reported in 1885 that his city's evening schools had been reorganized and provided with "the best of teachers, the best of schoolrooms, and the best of appliances, such as give life and progress to the day schools," though the relationship of the statute requiring evening classes to these changes remains unclear. Across the state, judging by the State Board of Education's dissatisfaction with the response, the 1883 statute failed to achieve the expectations of its supporters. A year after passage, at least one-third of the thirty-one cities and towns falling under the Act's requirements had not yet complied, while a number had appropriated insufficient funds for any but the most cursory evening program. Unable to enforce compliance by municipalities or to demand attendance where schools were open, the Board's Secretary concluded that despite the 1883 legislation, the reigning permissive attitude continued to undermine the potential utility of evening classes.[13]

---

[12] Ibid., 1882-82, pp. 187-90; Springfield, School Report, 1883, pp. 21-22; ibid., 1884, p. 21; Boston, School Documents, 1889, #17; Cambridge, School Report, 1884, p. 16; Lowell, School Report, pp. 21-22; Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves, 1883, ch. 174.

Indeed, concern over the permissive nature of evening instruction, the discrepancy between the professed advantages to society in having all its citizens literate and the provisions actually made for classes to procure that literacy, led a number of the state's educators to appeal for compulsory attendance measures. Hardly waiting for the 1883 statute to take effect, Springfield's Superintendent A.P. Stone recommended that it be supplemented by requiring attendance of those needing additional schooling. In Haverhill, the Superintendent claimed that even with comfortable school rooms, good text books, and experienced teachers, attendance remained small and irregular, and similarly called for compulsory legislation. "I am inclining to the opinion," wrote the Superintendent in Fall River in 1887, "that the compulsory feature of the day schools should be incorporated into the evening schools. The amount of illiteracy that prevails in manufacturing centers, occasioned largely by the influx of this class from other countries, seems to demand legislation on this point if Massachusetts would maintain the position she has so long and proudly held for intelligence, and for the common school education of the children within her borders."[14]

---

[13] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1890-91, p. 75. The Lowell and Springfield statistics were compiled from the School Reports of those cities between 1881 and 1886. New Bedford, School Report, 1885, pp. 101-02; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1882-83, pp. 13-14; ibid., 1883-84, pp. 18-19. Not until the Industrial Education Commission began its work in 1907 did evening vocational classes become prominent. See above, pp. 244-45.

The Fall River Superintendent's remarks emphasized what was rapidly becoming the crucial issue of the evening school movement: illiteracy among Massachusetts' foreign born population. The state censuses of 1875 and 1885 and the national census of 1880 had revealed that a large number of immigrants could neither read nor write English. Although the findings were a good deal more complicated than often admitted, Massachusetts' educators focused on one clear issue: between twenty and twenty-five percent of the state's foreign born over ten years of age were illiterate in English as compared to less than two percent of the native born. Of the total population, native and foreign born, in 1885 in such major cities as Boston, Cambridge, Springfield, and Worcester, illiteracy amounted to around seven percent, but in the factory cities of Lawrence (9.37%), Lowell (10.76%), New Bedford (12.7%), Holyoke (16%), and Fall River (20.6%), the proportions were considerably higher, and almost all were foreign born. With illiteracy, the ability of individuals to communicate with the larger society, the sine qua non of responsible citizenship, the exceedingly large numbers unable to read or write English seemed nothing less than a threat to the republic.[15]

It was this concern which underlay the thrust of evening school agitation after 1880. Pleading for more extensive legislation than that provided in 1883, the Secretary of the State Board of Education argued: "In the face of the annual influx by immigration, further and more pertinent provisions by law are necessary to convert the great body of foreign-born, illiterate persons to intelligent, industrious citizens." A year later, Secretary Dickinson was even more explicit: "With 93,065 illiterates in the Commonwealth, and percentages of one in seven, eight and nine in manufacturing centers where indifferent provisions, or none whatever, are made for the education of untaught foreigners, remedial legislation is necessary."[16]

---

[14] Springfield, School Report, 1883, pp. 22-23; Haverhill, School Report, 1884, p. 24; ibid., 1885, pp. 51-52; Fall River, School Report, 1886-87, pp. 14-15.

[15] Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor, The Census of Massachusetts 1875 (Boston, 1876), pp. 643-67; ibid., 1885 (Boston, 1887), pp. 987-1143; ibid., A Compendium of

No single individual did more in a brief span of time to solidify this association of evening school education with foreign born illiteracy than E.C. Carrigan. An English-born Irishman, Carrigan had come to this country in 1857 at the age of five. After graduating from the Evening High School in Boston, he attended Dartmouth College, graduating in 1877. A part-time journalist with a forceful personality and an activist in education, Carrigan was appointed principal of Boston's Evening High School in 1881, after a period of sharp controversy during which the school was first modified, then closed, and finally reopened under Carrigan's supervision. More important, Carrigan devoted much of his time to legislative lobbying for education proposals, making him-

---

[15](cont.) the Census of Massachusetts, 1875 (Boston, 1877), p. 94; United States Department of the Interior, Statistics of the Population of the United States of the Tenth Census (Washington, 1883), pp. 919-20; Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1882-83, pp. 141-51; Journal of Education, 17:1/11/83, 24; ibid., 17: 1/18/83, 40. In all cases, illiteracy referred to those persons over ten years of age who were unable to read or write in the English language. Most evening school advocates overlooked questions raised by the census which complicated their arguments. For example, though they focused on the large cities, the census found some of the highest rates of illiteracy in the small towns of Cape Cod and the Berkshires. Similarly, although evening school supporters emphasized non-English speaking illiteracy, more than sixty percent of the state's illiterates were born in Ireland. Agitation for compulsory evening school attendance for those under twenty-one which emerged in the 1880's, moreover, overlooked the fact that around eighty percent of the foreign born illiterates were over thirty.

[16] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1882-83, p. 14; ibid., 1883-84, p. 20.

self a well-known and prominent figure at the Massachusetts State House. In 1883, he was appointed to the State Board of Education, and in January, 1888, became a member of the Boston School Committee, holding these positions of prominence within the state and city education hierarchies until his untimely death in November, 1888.[17]

Before his death, Carrigan enunciated a confused but nonetheless forceful rationale for state responsibility to eliminate foreign born illiteracy and the role of evening schools in that endeavor.

> Being a manufacturing State, bounded by the sea on one side, and but a day's journey from the Dominion of Canada, we are at the mercy of the manufacturer, who encourages the cheap, foreign illiterate laborer, and never asks whether he can sign the pay-roll in person, by mark, or by special power of attorney. And with the illiterate parent comes a swarm of illiterate children, many of whom, though far from their teens, swear that they are beyond the school age of fourteen, and hence not within the control of our school officials. To rebut the lying statement of the parent, as to the age of the child, is utterly impossible, since the baptismal record is in a foreign country, and more likely was never entered. With this state of things, I would ask, Is any community or Commonwealth responsible for its mass of foreign illiteracy? The community may not be, but the State is responsible, so far as its illiterate minors.

Claiming that state-wide needs demanded broad compulsory measures, Carrigan called upon the legislature to require evening school attendance for non-English speaking between the ages of fourteen and twenty-one.[18]

Carrigan's proposal essentially ignored the significant number of foreign born over twenty-one who could neither read nor write English, but he seems to have been reaching for a compromise which would satisfy industrial labor needs,' while forcing the assimilation of youth through evening classes. Submitted to the state legislature in 1884, Carrigan's bill was designed, wrote the Journal of Education, to "throw an effective safeguard around the foreign illiterate youth, who in increasing numbers continue to flock into the State." Initially rebuffed by the legislature in May, 1884, Carrigan redoubled his efforts. In November, he called fifty of the state's leading educators to a meeting in Boston on evening schools, reaching agreement on the need to propagandize for compulsory classes. By the beginning of 1887, he had marshalled enough support at the State House to achieve his objective, and, in the single most important evening school legislation before World War I, compulsory attendance of non-English reading and writing minors was combined with restrictions upon the employer's right to hire. No child under fourteen who could not read and write simple English sentences could be employed in any mercantile or mechanical establishment. All illiterates between fourteen and twenty-one years of age were required to attend either day or evening classes during the period the schools were open, and no employer could grant work to such individuals without receipt of school attendance certificates, at the risk of fifty to one hundred dollar fines.[19]

---

[17] "Obituary on E.C. Carrigan," Journal of Education, 28: 11/15/88, 320. On the controversy over the Boston Evening High School in the early 1880's, see Carrigan's remarks in American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings and Addresses, 1885, pp. 280-83; Boston, School Documents, 1880, #16; ibid., 1881, #20.

[18] Carrigan's remarks in American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1885, pp. 276-80, 283-86.

The 1887 legislation reshaped Massachusetts' system of evening schools, legitimizing and providing them with a sharply defined social function: the teaching of literacy to the non-English speaking. Changing evening schools from voluntaristic institutions to places of compulsion for the majority of their attendees, the legislation increased the size and heterogeneity of the student body. Its impact, moreover, forced evening school educators to reconceptualize their roles, their pedagogic techniques, and their relationship to the day schools, in the process helping to forge new definitions of citizenship education. Responding to the new statute, Lawrence's Superintendent of Schools articulated its rationale: "The cost of educating and thereby Americanizing the large number of illiterate foreigners who are gradually but surely increasing in our manufacturing centers is great, and the work is difficult. Our public schools alone can do it. Legislation has commenced none too soon."[20]

---

[19] Journal of Education, 19: 5/22/84, 328; ibid., 5/29/84, 345; ibid., 20: 12/4/84, 360-61; ibid., 25: 3/24/87, 184-85, 188; Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves, 1887, ch. 433. School committees could waive these requirements in cases of individual need, for example, where a child was physically too weak to work and attend school. Literacy was defined by the reading and writing of simple sentences in English, a requirement loose enough to provide great leeway for local officials.

The most immediate and obvious changes lay in the student body. In New Bedford, evening school enrollments went from slightly above 500 in 1886 to more than 900 a year later and over 1400 in 1888. Whereas at least sixty percent of the students in 1886 were either native born or of English, Scotch, or Irish birth, around seventy-five percent two years later were non-English speaking foreign born. In neighboring Fall River, evening school registration doubled in a year, from 1555 to 3039, half of whom were illiterate in English. Even in the limited immigrant city of Springfield, the change was dramatic. In 1884, the Superintendent there had noted the great variety of backgrounds among the evening elementary school students, only some of whom were foreigners. By the end of the 1880's, these same schools had become predominantly foreign born. At the turn of the century, Massachusetts' evening elementary schools, now dominating the night school program, had become more than a majority foreign born in most large cities. In Worcester in 1893, for example, more than fifty percent of the evening students had little or no knowledge of English. Of the 13,758 pupils enrolled in Boston's evening elementary classes during the 1906-07 school year, 9006 were foreign born, with ninety percent of those from non-English speaking countries. The increased numbers and more heterogeneous student bodies quickly led to increased expenditures, and in the decade after the 1887 Act, evening schools went from a nominal expense in most cities to a small but no longer insubstantial part of the regular school budget. And, as important, the rising tide of non-English speaking immigrants made continued growth of evening school costs even more likely.[21]

---

[20] Lawrence, School Report, 1887, pp. 32-34.

Now dramatically confronted with the problems of schooling the immigrant, Massachusetts' educators moved to formalize and systematize their evening classes. In a number of cities, committees on evening schools and newly appointed supervisors set to work analyzing the progress and deficiencies of their programs. Registration records were introduced with forms showing compliance to the attendance requirements forwarded to local employers. For the first time, courses of study were regularized, textbooks introduced, and explicit discussion of subject matter and goals undertaken. The large numbers and heterogeneity of the student body frequently led school systems to categorize pupils by abilities or, more accurately, by degrees of English literacy or previous schooling. Separate classes composed exclusively of a single nationality which had appeared before 1887 became prominent after 1890 conforming to the increasingly segregated residential patterns of the cities, seeming to facilitate teaching, and offering ready companionship to an uncertain and insecure student body. "Until within a few years the classes for those who were unable to speak the English language were confined wholly to French speaking pupils but at the present time we have in operation classes for Swedes, Portuguese, Armenians, and Greeks," wrote Lowell's evening school committee in 1893, describing a process which differed from other cities only in nationality groups.[22]

---

[21] New Bedford, School Report, 1886, pp. 30-33; ibid., 1887, pp. 45-46; ibid., 1888, pp. 55-56, 79; Fall River, School Report, 1887-88, pp. 14-15, 63; ibid., 1888-89, pp. 6, 14; ibid., 1889, p. 6; ibid., 1890, p. 6; Springfield, School Report, 1884, pp. 21-22; ibid., 1888, p. 13; Worcester, Suggestions to Teachers and Hours of Study in the Evening Schools, 1893; Boston, School Documents, 1907, #13, pp. 90-91; Lowell, School Report, 1887, p. 26. Expenditures for evening schools as a proportion of total school costs in the state increased from just over one percent in the early 1880's to around two percent by 1890. However, the latter percentage held firm through to World War I. The percentages have been compiled from statistics in the Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Reports for those years. See, e.g., the report for 1901-02, p. 109.

Compulsory attendance for evening school pupils soon intensified concern over motivation. "It should be borne in mind that the elementary evening schools work under certain peculiar disadvantages. They deal with pupils whose attendance is forced by the law, which says in effect that if the pupil does not attend school he shall not work," declared Fall River's Superintendent of Schools in 1903. "The pupils go to school when tired by a long day of exhaustive labor and so in poor condition to receive instruction." To offset these difficulties, experienced teachers were brought into the school and instructed to provide a congenial atmosphere for thei r students. "Try to make them feel that they are coming to school not because they are obliged to, but because they wish to, because they know America means Opportunity for them as well as for us, and that Opportunity now knocks at their door in the shape of the instruction offered by the Evening Schod," Lawrence's evening school supervisor told his staff. Readers specifically written for non-English speaking men and women were introduced to replace the elementary school textbooks heretofore used. Since evening school pupils were generally mature young men and women, Springfield's former Superintendent of Schools Thomas Balliet informed the readers of Sara O'Brien's widely used English for Foreigners, "their interests are those of adults, and the content of the lessons of a children's Reader does not appeal to them."

---

[22] Lowell, School Report, 1893, p. 17. Examples of registration forms can be found in Haverhill, School Report, 1896, pp. 40-41; Fall River, School Report, 1898, pp. 22-26. For attempts to improve relations with local employers, see New Bedford, School Report, 1911, p. 68; Clarence A. Perry, Wider Use of the School Plant (New York,1910), pp. 101-02. On evening school courses of study, see Boston, School Documents, 1888, #6; ibid., 1903, #12; ibid., 1907, #13; ibid., 1911, #10; Lawrence, A Syllabus for the Instruction of Non-English Speaking Pupils in the Evening Schools, 1908. For the categorization of students by national origins, see Lowell, School Report, 1886, p. 28; ibid., 1895, pp. 21-22; Lynn, School Report, 1891, p. 59; ibid., 1905, p. 27; Boston, School Documents, 1889, #17, p. 5; ibid., 1892, #22, p. 38; ibid., 1907, #13, pp. 90-91; ibid., 1911, #10, pp. 31-32; Haverhill, School Report, 1888, p. 29. Separation by nationality though predominant was not universal. See Haverhill, School Report, 1895, p. 19. Robert Woods reported that Jews and Italians in Boston's North End had to be separated in the evening classes because of conflict between them. Robert A. Woods, Americans in Process (Boston, 1903), pp. 311-12. For a national view of these issues, see Perry, Wider Use, pp. 31-32, 79-114.

> In this little book the lessons treat of topics of intrinsic interest to mature minds, while the language is simple and easy, as it should be. Instead of reading about the "doll," the "top," the "cat," and like topics, and learning a child's vocabulary, pupils using this book will acquire useful knowledge, and with it a vocabulary which will enable them to speak, read, and write about it after the manner of adults.

"A large number of readers designed for non-English speaking people, and a good supply of supplementary reading on American life, biography, and history are much needed," Boston's Director of Evening Schools similarly concluded in 1907, if evening schools were to function as effectively as the times demanded.[23]

Under pressure to secure rapid and effective instruction of the foreign born, a number of school systems distributed special instructional material to their evening school teachers. Boston's "The Teaching of English to Adult Foreigners," for example, informed instructors that they would have to overcome the "jaded" mental faculties of students physically exhausted at the end of a day's work. "Something that will quicken their wits and set their machinery in action is essential. This is readily found in humor. A joke, an anecdote, a humorous remark here and there will act like a powerful mental tonic, and put the class in a right condition for study. It is true some time will be consumed by the laughter that is sure to follow, but this never fails to arouse their slumbering faculties and thus compensate for it tenfold." The instructional essay further cautioned prospective teachers on the pessimism which many of their students would initially exhibit.

---

[23] Fall River, School Report, 1903, pp. 22-23; Lawrence, Syllabus for...Non-English Speaking Pupils, p. 2; Thomas Balliet in Sara R. O'Brien, English for Foreigners (Boston, 1909), p. ii; Boston, School Documents, 1907, #17, p. 49; ibid., 1895, #4, p. 105; Lawrence, School Report, 1895, pp. 28-29.

> The intricacies of the English language are so enormous to an adult foreigner as to overwhelm him in his first attempt to familiarize himself with it; and it is the invariable experience of teachers of English to adult foreigners to hear from them despondent remarks to that effect. Now, nothing is more fatal to study than lack of confidence on the part of the pupil in his own ability. While a person is under the impression that it is impossible for him to learn something, that very impression will make it so indeed. Therefore the first aim of a teacher ought to be to overcome that pessimism in his pupils in the very beginning, and there nip the evil in its bud.[24]

To help in accomplishing this task, handbooks on teaching and courses of study offered information on pedagogical techniques, the atmosphere in which classes should be conducted, and lesson plans. Sara O'Brien's two textbooks for the foreign born reproduced the exact questions in proper order that teachers should present to their classes, in addition to providing reading lessons, language exercises, grammatical rules, and vocabulary words. A Syllabus for the Instruction of Non-English Speaking Pupils in the Evening Schools, distributed by the Lawrence School Committee in 1908, told teachers how to organize their classes by sex, nationality, and general intelligence, before explaining what and how the lessons should be taught. Since English was the dominant concern, subject matter had to be presented solely in that language, first through elementary conversation lessons, then written. "The teaching for a considerable time should be almost entirely oral, in order to train the ear and the vocal organs.'" Language, wrote John J. Mahony, Supervisor of Lawrence's evening schools, whose work received national attention, had to develop out of exposure to objects and actions, and therefore, all lessons should revolve around a material theme--opening the door, closing a window--broken down into a series of steps leading to the completion of the action. Teachers were told to present their material in a highly structured and methodical manner, with each step having a definite purpose logically leading to the next step. To any uncertain of what material should be taught, evening school readers left little room for doubt.[25]

---

[24] Boston, School Documents, 1907, #13, pp. 67-68.

This mixture of congeniality and systematic instruction, the emphasis upon opportunity through schooling, was hardly limited to the evening school movement. Pedagogical changes throughout the educational system had seen a growing emphasis on the material rather than the abstract and upon involvement of the student in the learning process. Concern for the physical requirements of learning -- proper lighting and ventilation, more adequate school desks, medical examinations -- developed in the day school simultaneously as complaints about evening school accommodations became prominent.[26] Similarly, improved textbooks, instructional materials more responsive to age and ability levels, revised courses of study, and handbooks on teaching were all part of a broader phenomenon of professionalization in education. The significance of these trends when applied to the evening schools, however, lay in their explicit application to the foreign born. After 1890, the formalization of night schools became intimately tied to teaching the immigrant how to act; textbooks for the non-English speaking became handbooks for life in America. Directed at the foreign born, Massachusetts' evening schools began to establish themselves as the agency through which individuals earned the right to become and learned how to be citizens, helping transform an amorphous conception of citizenship into patriotic patterns of behavior.

Prior to the 1880's, evening classes as supplements to the inadequate elementary schooling of the poor and working class offered the elements of learning and literacy available to the more fortunate day school children, providing a basis for moral decision-making, responsible citizenship, and, to a lesser extent, economic opportunity. Working under a tradition of voluntarism, they exhibited an implicit optimism in the socialization process, in the citizenship training and decision-making which occurred outside the classroom. Although evening classes were valuable, they were neither mandatory for the individual's ability to act responsibly nor for the safety of society. They thus provided an option for those who had failed to complete their schooling, and their curriculum and teaching techniques, where possible, imitated those of the day schools. To a great extent, the systematization of night school programs, the special committees and supervisors of evening schools, the courses of study and pedagogical recommendations, the transfer to day school classrooms, all represented part of the legitimization process designed to make evening schools comparable to the day classes.

---

[25] O'Brien, English for Foreigners, 1909; ibid., English for Foreigners, Book 2 (Boston, 1912); Lawrence, Syllabus for...Non-English Speaking Pupils.

[26] See, for example, Boston, School Documents, 1885, #4, pp. 83-90.

The decision to require the attendance of the immigrant young at night schools in 1887, reinforced by subsequent legislative acts, reflected a significant change in attitude. With compulsion now replacing voluntarism, the education of the foreign born, once open to a multiplicity of agencies, became synonymous with school attendance, optimism about socialization implicit in an earlier period gave way to pessimism about the immigrant's ability to "get along" without formal instruction. Evening schools no longer saw their function simply in terms of literacy and broad moral values as a basis for citizenship, but increasingly assumed the tasks of explaining the environment to the newcomers, offering them specific instructions on how to behave, and instilling an emotional commitment to improving their environment. Evening school readers added special sections on personal hygiene and health care, teaching the foreign born how to recognize and avoid tuberculosis, the importance of brushing one's teeth and keeping proper grooming habits. An array of job opportunities was presented, with brief sketches explaining the requirements of the work, the benefits derived, and the steps to take in applying for a job, though the occupations discussed tended to emphasize the manual arts of rural and small town America -- blacksmith, cobbler, tailor -- and rarely included the professions of medicine, law, or teaching as possible vocational choices. Textbooks explained the workings of government and the relationship of governmental agencies to one another, warning their readers to avoid the corrupting politics of the "machine" and ward "boss", and presenting the exact procedures necessary to qualify for one's naturalization papers. In Boston, a special committee was set up in 1907 to construct a civic primer for evening school use "which shall deal concretely with those phases of municipal government with which the foreigner first comes into contact." Lawrence's evening instructional staff was similarly told to offer weekly talks on hygiene, city government, national holidays and songs, current events, and instructions to be followed in public places.[27]

Seeking to improve the immigrant's environment and his way of life, evening schools presented rural America as the ideal. In her instructions for a lesson on the United States, Sara O'Brien, for example, suggested that teachers "point out the great centers of population...and contrast the opportunities offered in the less thickly settled parts of the country with the disadvantages of segregation in the big cities." All evening school textbooks contained sections on farm life, while many of the activities described could only occur in small town America. For those unable to move westward, however, the city might approximate rural ideals. Clean homes, community cooperation, and the support of municipal agencies -- the police and fire departments, the health services, the schools--could make the city a center of opportunity. Instruction in behavior was invariably reinforced by inspirational readings and discussions. "This country is the United States of America," began one lesson. "It is the land of freedom and liberty, because the people govern themselves. All citizens love their country, because they know that this freedom was earned by men who gave their lives for it." Lessons on Lincoln--"By hard work and close study, he became a man of strong and noble character, and did a great work for his country"--Washington--a leader chosen by his people to lead his country in peace and war -- and Edison were presented to show America's most admired values, while immigrant success stories--Carnegie, Schurz, Riis--revealed the opportunities available to all.

---

[27] Boston, School Documents, 1907, #13, pp. 36-37; Lawrence, Syllabus for...Non-English Speaking Pupils; O'Brien, English for Foreigners, 1909, pp. 16, 23-26, 41, 34-49, 71-72, 81-86, 90-91, 123-50; ibid., English for Foreigners, Book 2, pp. 39-40, 60-61, 67-68, 86-89, 98-109, 167-91; William E. Chancellor, Standard Short Course for Evening Schools (New York, 1911), pp. 42-47, 68-69, 218-59; Mabel Hill and Philip Davis, Civics for New Americans (Boston, 1915), passim. Two legislative attempts to strengthen the evenings schools were Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves, 1902, ch. 183 and 1911, ch. 241.

> Patriotism and civic pride are inculcated, and the duties of citizenship and the rudiments of American government--municipal, state, and national--are explained in carefully chosen words; while the advantages of cleanliness, of industry, of thrift, of study, of education, the value of the public library, etc., are impressed upon the pupils as means of improvement and advancement. Thus, while he is acquiring our language, the foreigner is gaining the necessary acquaintance with our institutions and ideals that will tend to make him a happier individual and a better citizen.[28]

While English language instruction for the foreign born had initially crystallized the evening school movement, by the early twentieth century, the language itself had become only a first step in teaching proper behavior and American ideals. Behavior, the act itself, replaced literacy and the inculcation of moral values as the defining element of citizenship education. "As the public day school is the most effective means of Americanizing the children who come from foreign lands to our shores in such large numbers every year," Springfield's Thomas Balliet told a National Education Association audience in 1904, "so the public evening school should be made the institution which shall Americanize their parents by teaching them our language, our history, and the principles of our government." "...Upon us devolves the expensive and never ending task of teaching them [the foreign born] that which they most need if they are ever to become American citizens in fact as well as in name," wrote Lowell's Superintendent of Schools two years later in a discussion of his city's evening classes, "--a task never ending because a new crop comes on as fast as the old one is cleared off."[29]

---

[28] O'Brien, English for Foreigners, 1909, pp. vi, 120-22, 123, 138, 145, 191-97; Chancellor, Short Course, pp. 24, 28-31, 33, 35, 53, 106-08, 111-13.

Before World War I, evening schools never achieved the central place their supporters hoped. Despite compulsory legislation, many immigrants refused to come or acquired just enough English to pass the minimal demands of the statute. "The education of immigrants who have passed the age of elementary school attendance, especially those from sixteen to twenty-four years of age, remains a greatly neglected problem," State Commissioner of Education David Snedden noted in his 1914-15 Annual Report. The peculiar needs of teaching the foreign born, he continued, were being given too little attention.

> The proper training of adult foreign-born Americans in the use of English, and their instruction in those phases of civics, American history, sanitation and other related subjects which they can best assimilate, can be done only by specially qualified teachers. These must be prepared to select, organize and employ a wide range of teaching materials, and to use processes quite different from those which have become accepted in ordinary school and college instruction. But nearly all these teachers would be employed on a part-time basis, since most of the classes for foreigners will necessarily be evening classes. Perhaps public school teachers will continue to give evening school instruction, as is now frequently the case. But if so, these teachers, no less than persons following other occupations during the day, should have special training for evening school work with adults.

Despite existing legislation, local communities often failed to provide adequate provision for their evening schools "partly because of the expense, partly because of inadequate means of administration, and partly because of local indifference." "The development of a sound and effective program of education for adult foreigners is dependent on additional legislation, generous State support (to which might well be added support from the national government) and comprehensive State supervision." All of that would await America's entry into World War I and the resulting frenzy of Americanization, but the themes of evening school responsibility, the definition of citizenship as behavior, and the teaching of citizenship as the inculcation of explicit ways to act had already been established.[30]

---

[29] Thomas Balliet, "Evening Schools," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1904, p. 281; Lowell, School Report, 1906, p. 51.

## III

Citizenship education, the new methodology for teaching citizens, was not confined to evening classes for immigrants. In the elementary and secondary schools, children also received instruction in the processes of becoming Americans and what being an American involved. The teaching of behavior and its corollary, the belief that only through classroom instruction could the ideals of American life be communicated to the urban dweller, were becoming pervasive features of Massachusetts' public schools. In the day schools, these themes received their most pronounced manifestation in the increased importance of and the changes in the teaching of American history and the emergence of civics as a course of study.

In its most traditional form, history had functioned as an adjunct to other subjects; in the high schools and colleges, most frequently as an aspect of literature and languages. Viewed as one of many ways to train and stimulate the mental faculties, whatever distinctiveness history possessed lay in its synthesis of factual knowledge with reflections upon the higher and more abstract meanings of social development. Concerned with training the mind, history's significance in the shaping of a national identity was limited to the creation of articulate, thoughtful men. An individual nation's past, particularly one's own, was thus no more relevant than another's, unless it elaborated cultural contributions or political and social theory which had enlarged man's understanding of society. The lessons of history were supranational, unhindered by the borders of chronology or geography. Yet history was also related to civics, setting standards by which to measure contemporary activities. Prior to the Civil War, it pointed out for Americans the pathways by which they had established union, the moral basis of their society, and the underlying unity of American life. Concerned with the inculcation of national pride and communal loyalties, in order to secure the new nation's stability, historians looked to the spiritual and moral in the past rather than the institutional, and they placed America under divine superintendence, unfolding chronology as an "emanation of spirit." Though the politics of its authors differed, history as civic instruction adopted the common notion that its obligation was to lay bare the spiritual unity of American society.[31]

---

[30] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1914-15, pp. 58-59; Massachusetts Commission on Immigration, The Problem of Immigration in Massachusetts (Boston, 1914), pp. 117-46, 217-23.

Throughout the nineteenth and into the twentieth century, these amorphous goals--history as mental discipline and civic inspiration--remained central to school instruction. "No branch of study is so well fitted to supply to a boy the defects of his own limited experience, to enrich, strengthen, and enoble his mind and character as History...," noted a Boston School Report in 1870. Introducing one of his school textbooks, John Fiske recommended history for its ability "to arouse his [the student's] interest and stimulate his faculties to healthful exercise," revealing, Brown University's President declared, the anachronisms of the present and offsetting contemporary materialism. "The first and main object of the study of United States history," wrote a committee of the Boston School Board in 1907, articulating the most frequent justification for its study, "is that the pupils may know the conditions of their country in the past, compared with those of to-day, may realize the struggles and heroism of the previous generations which produced the present glorious heritage, and, finally, that they may grow to feel that sacredness of the hard-won peace, and prosperity and comfort of to-day, and their own responsibility toward the continuation of it." Reading their nation's history proved, one of the country's most prolific textbook authors concluded, that "America Means Opportunity." "Here every advantage is open. Education is absolutely free; millions of acres of Western land are free....Here every law springs directly from the will of the majority."[32]

---

[31] Richard Hofstadter, The Progressive Historians (New York, 1968), pp. 3-4, 12-18; John Higham, et. al., History: The Development of Historical Studies in the United States (Englewood Cliffs, 1965), p. 95.

Yet if history seemed capable of communicating the spiritual essence of American life, its basis of analysis and its pedagogy underwent significant modification in the half century after the Civil War. The war itself raised serious questions about American unity, doubts quieted only by a more insistent emphasis on unity and a more vigorous commitment to teaching its value. In the last decades of the nineteenth century, the easy optimism about America's ability to blend its discordant elements into harmonious patterns gave way before a continuing barrage of labor strife, ethnic divisions, and the seeming permanence of the heterogeneous city. Historical writing could no longer assume America's spiritual unity, but had explicitly to refute the apparent social divisions and portray the underlying harmony of union. In addition, historians began to work with a new definition of progress, moving from an emphasis upon America's distinctive politico-spiritual contributions to a focus on technological advancement. The field of historical scholarship was similarly changing with professionals and an extraordinary proliferation of monographs and courses replacing ante-bellum traditions of amateurism. With its roots in German academia, professional and scientific history refocused historical analysis from the spiritual and ideal to the institutional as reflection of the spiritual, a process further accentuated by social Darwinism's concern with origins, evolution, and function.[33]

---

[32] Boston, School Report, 1870, p. 305; John Fiske, A History of the United States for Schools (Boston, 1901), pp. iii-iv; E. Benjamin Andrews, "The Indispensableness of Historical Studies for Teachers," American Institute of Instruction, Proceedings, 1889, p. 2; Boston, School Documents, 1907, #5, p. 78; D.H. Montgomery, The Leading Facts of American History (Boston, 1891), p. 359.

To varying degrees, these trends all influenced the teaching of history in Massachusetts' public schools. Concerned about the large number of immigrants entering the state unacquainted with its past, the state legislature added American history to the public school's required course of study in 1857. As immigration increased in the last decades of the century, with social divisions becoming more apparent, American history assumed heightened importance in the process of verifying and inculcating the unity of American social life. "If one of the functions of the public schools is to make loyal American citizens of the children of foreigners," Springfield's Superintendent of Schools wrote in 1892, "certainly the teaching of our country's history would seem to be the most effective means of accomplishing this purpose." The American past was especially relevant during periods of ethnic tension as a means of achieving consensus on social values and what historical material should be studied. In Boston, for example, conflict at the end of the 1880's over anti-Catholic biases in a world history textbook caused a major political furor. Although the agitation had roots considerably deeper than the teaching of history, its outcome in the city's schools was to enhance the role of American history while deemphasizing non-American studies, thus opting out of the controversial judgments of the medieval and Reformation periods.[34]

---

[33] Hofstadter, Progressive Historians, pp. 8, 24-27; Higham, History, pp. 4, 6-25, 94-96, 150-57.

The broadening of historical scholarship in the country at large also turned American history textbooks from simple chronicles of seemingly inevitable events, usually wars and Presidential administrations, to discussions of social life and occasionally institutional complexity, while the new professionalization added footnotes, supplementary reading lists, and suggested research topics to the leading school texts. Technological advancement as the new definition of progress also appeared in the school readers. While a prominently used text just after the Civil War failed to mention even one major technological innovation, later works gave full pages to the steamboat, the Erie Canal, railroads, and the cotton gin among the ante-bellum inventions, and waxed eloquent over the more recent machines and their inventors.[35] The past became, as never before, a statement of social progress and a handbook for behavior. Whereas it had once been appealed to as a source of respect for law, the courts, and constitution, it now became a means of inculcating individual responsibility. Uncertain about the environment in which school children were growing, Massachusetts' educators adopted history as an explicit guide to the present, offering instruction in how unity could be retained and progress assured. One of the more striking examples of this trend was the increased importance attached to and the reformulation of biography in the classroom.

---

[34] Massachusetts, Acts and Resolves, 1857, ch. 206; Thomas Balliet in Journal of Education, 35: 5/5/92, 275; Boston, School Documents, 1902, #15, pp.11-12. On the Travis-Swinton affair in Boston over the teaching of medieval history, see Isabella Mac Dougall, "Transformation of an Ideal: Boston Public Schools, 1888-1891," unpublished honors thesis, Radcliffe College, 1967, pp. 69-70; Lois B. Merk, "Boston's Historic Public School Crisis," New England Quarterly, 31: June, 1958, 172-99; Boston, School Documents, 1889, #11; ibid., 1890, #8, #13; Solomon Schindler, "The Study of History in the Public Schools," The Arena, 1:12/89, 41-54.

[35] Contrast John J. Anderson, A Grammar School History of the United States (New York, 1869), a widely used textbook in Massachusetts just after the Civil War, with D.H. Montgomery, The Leading Facts of American History or Edward Channing, A Students' History of the United States (New York, 1901), two popular texts at the turn of the century.

While biography's role continued to be inspirational, an object lesson in "courage, self-denial, fidelity to trust, perseverance, patriotism, humanity," at the turn of the century, it sought to do so through the examples of "real people." Previously concerned with individuals as heroic myth, particularly in the first decades of the nineteenth century, biography now became the study of the great but human in action, subjects of idolization, but more important, of imitation. Finding history a constant process of modification to new conditions, John Fiske, one of the country's most widely read historians, informed his school readers, that such modifications were undertaken by individuals whose actions thus provided lessons for the contemporary reader. In a similar fashion, Horace E. Scudder revised his widely used textbook, A History of the United States, so that "a much greater attention has been paid to that element of personality which gives vitality to all history. "By biographic details and a liberal use of portraits I have sought to interest the student in the men who have been the architects of the nation." Because school children possess an "unfailing interest in biography," wrote another textbook author,"...I have sought to arouse and encourage a feeling of *friendly familiarity* with the heroes of our nation." (ML's italics) In short, "biography is most important, making the past real and peopled by live human beings like ourselves," concluded a proposed course of study for the Boston public schools in 1907.[36]

In practice, the biographic sketches of most history readers undoubtedly fell short of achieving identification between the urban school child and the sketch's subject.

---

[36] Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1889-90, p. 149; John Fiske, Civil Government in the United States Considered with some Reference to Its Origins (Boston, 1890), p. iii; Horace E. Scudder, A History of the United States of America (New York, 1907), p.v; Eva March Tappan, Our Country's Story: An Elementary History of the United States (Boston, 1902), p. iii; Boston, School Documents, 1907, #5, p. 79. The textbooks and authors cited above and those referred to below were widely used in Massachusetts' public schools between 1880 and 1915.

William Penn, "an excellent scholar" who "spoke five or six languages," "was fond of out-of-door sports, rode well, danced well, was a good sportsman, and a favorite wherever he went," must have seemed a far cry from "real life" and "friendly familiarity." Urban dwellers were told that Lincoln's early life was "spent in toil, hardship, and poverty, conditions they could readily identify with, "but it was the independent poverty of the Western wilderness, and it made men of those who fought their way out of it," seemingly eliminating most Massachusetts' school children from such a possibility. Yet in providing the details of great men's lives, late nineteenth and early twentieth century history books did reduce the magnitude of the myth. In the following sketch of Benjamin Franklin's early life, school children could undoubtedly achieve some sense of identification.

> Franklin was born in Boston and was one of a family of seventeen children. He showed so early a brightness of mind that his father sent him to school and meant to make a minister of him. He quickly made his way to the top, but his father was alarmed at the expense of sending him to college and so took him into his shop and set him to making candles. Franklin was a leader among the boys and was so full of enterprise that his father feared he would run away to sea, so he finally made him an apprentice to another of his sons who was a printer. James Franklin set up a newspaper and Benjamin began to write for it, but without letting his brother know he wrote the pieces. The brothers did not get along very well, and when he was seventeen Benjamin left James in the lurch, got together some money by selling his books, and made his way to Philadelphia.

The importance of biography lay in stimulating aspiration to the highest ideals through acquaintance with a great individual's real rather than mythical life. As important, it asserted the individual's role in the shaping of society, the responsibility for decision-making placed upon each of America's citizens. "Biography," noted the Suggestions to Teachers on the Course of Study in Worcester, "is the basis of history," and without the commitment by each individual to do good, progress could not be assured.[37]

---

[37] Tappan, Our Country's Story, p. 99; Montgomery, Leading Facts, p. 279, fn.2; Scudder, History, 1907, pp. 117-18, fn. 1; Worcester, Suggestions to Teachers on the

The biographic approach to history provided a sense of immediacy and familiarity with the past. Personalization brought the child into both the noble and the everyday activities of the great, synthesizing the inspirational and the practical. Although a certain ambiguity existed over the place of the individual at a time when professional historical scholarship emphasized institutional developments and the role of underlying forces, in the school textbooks, biography seemed a clear statement to the child that he was responsible for his own behavior, that his chances for success lay in his actions, and that society had a stake in those decisions. But biography was not the sole means whereby history and civics merged, the past becoming a guide to action in the present. Equally, if not more important, was the loss of chronology, the disappearance of time, and the creation of ahistorical history appearing in the pedagogy of the classroom.

There are two basic approaches to historical scholarship representing contrasting methods, goals, and ideologies. In the best of circumstances, they are integrated; often, however, they are not. The first assumes the past sacred and allows its documents and artifacts to shape the questions asked and the answers offered. The second starts with the contemporary, making of present questions the coercive rationale for studying the past. The former is concerned with observation and recording, the laying out of the events and activities of earlier generations. The latter emphasizes origins, development, analogy, and immediacy. By the turn of the century, the second of these approaches dominated the teaching of history in Massachusetts' schools. History became a mirror or, more accurately, a reflection of what one wished to see in the present. Alternatively, the past also became a way of tracing the origin and growth of a contemporary phenomenon. In its most extreme form, the study of history became a selective process of the recognizable. Noting, for

---

37(cont.) Course of Study for Primary and Grammar Schools, 1893, p. 37. On biography as inspiration and individual responsibility, see Mary Antin, The Promised Land (Boston, 1912), pp. 222-25.

example, that some material on ancient and medieval history was being included in a course of study in United States History, the Cambridge School Department, writing in 1922, but summarizing the pre-War trend, declared "those features of ancient and medieval life have been illustrated which explain either important elements of our civilization or which show how the movement for discovery and colonization originated." "When we come to the jury system in the reign of King Henry II," one writer in The History Teacher's Magazine declared in 1909, "it is pertinent and profitable to digress into a clear discussion of the jury of today...." The marathon runner of ancient Greece and the telegraph, another wrote, should be treated analogously.

> Why do we begin west of the Indian peninsula, and ignore the Hindoos, the Chinese, the Japanese? Because these people are out of the great stream of development. The progressive life of today's world owes little to them, if anything. But the nations we take up have had a direct connection with us. One has handed on to another the torch of progress which now burns with electric splendor in our hands.[38]

In part, this new concern with germination, evolution, and analogy reflected the impact of Darwinism on historical scholarship. History became a seamless web of institutional development, its traditions and events immediately influential on the present. "The history of a nation is the development of that nation. It is a process. It is one thing--an unfolding from a germ," its lesson the elaboration of a nation's unity, George Martin told a gathering of educators in 1884. Narratives of past events which simply laid out the relationship of a particular historical situation, Martin wrote six years later, were no longer adequate. History had to be presented as evolution, "conceived as a process by which one thing (viz., the colonial germ, simple and rudimentary) became another well-known thing (viz., our country as it is to-day), . . . [providing thereby] a singleness of thought which is conducive to clearness and to interest." To aid students in seeing the immediacy of the past, its intimate relationship to the present, "the historian fixes upon those [facts] only which he thinks will help him show the grander features of a people's origin, rise, progress, and vicissitudes," Frank A. Hill, one of Massachusetts' most prominent educators, explained to teachers about to use John Fiske's *History of the United States*.[39]

---

[38] Cambridge, Provisional Course of Study in United States History, 1922, p. 8; C.B. Newton, "English History in the Secondary School," The History Teacher's Magazine, 1:10/09, 34-35; William Fairley, "Ancient History in the Secondary School," ibid., 11/09, 61; ibid., 9/09, 8.

The commitment to finding the present in the past led some educators to question whether history should even begin by studying previous generations. Former United States Commissioner of Education John Eaton, for example, told the readers of the *Journal of Education* in 1892 that the best way to teach history was to begin with the "near in place and time," an argument which received even greater prominence after 1900. Undoubtedly the most extreme form of this approach came from David Snedden, Massachusetts' Commissioner of Education from 1910 to 1916. For Snedden, history was simply the searching of the past for what society wanted to establish in the present. History teachers were thus obligated to know the values they wished to inculcate in their students, directing all history lessons toward those ends. "Having once conceived of the citizen as we should like to have him," Snedden told a gathering of the New England History Teachers Association in 1914, "we can work back and by analysis find the numberless specific forms of training by which we can produce this type." "We do not need chronological order. My idea is that instead of taking history in your secondary schools and teaching it as history in chronological order, at first you draw up a definite purpose, and then you take whatever you are working on and draw upon history for material."[40]

---

[39] George Martin, "Special Preparation for Citizenship," American Institute of Instruction, *Proceedings*, *1884*, p. 76; Massachusetts Board of Education, *Annual Report*, 1889-90, p. 150; Frank A. Hill in Fiske, *History*, p. xix; Higham, *History*, pp. 94-95.

Snedden's blunt and crass indictment of historical scholarship, his call to collapse all history into educational sociology and current events did not go unchallenged. A generation of professional historians continued to argue for the sacredness of the past. In the schools, however, it had already become clear that history had ceased to be relevant as a recording of the past, its signficance in the classroom now lay in its ability to reproduce the desirable in the present. Nowhere was this more obvious than in the addition of civics to the public school curriculum and its relationship to instruction in history.

Civics and citizenship instruction had always existed in the common schools, rarely, however, as independent courses of study. Before the Civil War, the term "civics" does not appear to have been used, while courses on civil government until the end of the nineteenth century usually discussed formal institutions and, to a lesser extent, political theory, particularly as found in the Constitution. George Martin's textbook on civil government, for example, published in 1875, devoted itself to such broad concepts as the source of authority in the state, the forms, functions, and obligations of government, and the nature and duties of citizenship. Combining an emphasis on governmental structures with political theory, Martin's text traced the origins of American government in England and the colonies, the workings of its various departments, and the role of the Constitution. Still confident of American unity and the soundness of political institutions, Martin could easily raise philsophical questions about the "duty of revolution" when government "fails to meet its obligations to people." The rebel, he maintained, was not easily classified; George Washinton was both a criminal and a patriot depending upon one's viewpoint. When he turned to government itself, as in his chapter on elections and nominations, Martin elaborated its structure and how it functioned. The legal qualifications to vote, methods of registering and voting, the certification of votes, and the convention as a nominating institution, these, Martin suggested, were the bases of American politics. While "at different times the United States has been called upon...to protect the State governments from domestic violence," the Massachusetts educator expressed little concern with such issues. As a textbook for citizenship, Civil Government was a study in self-satisfaction, a portrayal of a self-regulating system with only limited problems. Conflict, the threat of division, even after a civil war, seemed distant and abstract.[41]

---

[40] John Eaton, "Teaching Patriotism and Current Events," Journal of Education, 35: 2/18/92, 199-01; Snedden in History Teacher's Magazine, 5: 6/14, 186; David Snedden, "The Teaching of History in Secondary Schools," ibid., 5:11/14, 277-82. For a critique of Snedden's approach, see George L. Burr, "What History Shall We Teach?," ibid., 283-87.

Less than a decade later, however, George Martin's approach to the teaching of civil government had dramatically altered, reflecting a widespread change in the notion of civic education. Special preparation for citizenship was no longer a luxury, but a necessity, Martin told the American Institute of Instruction in 1884, and elementary school children had to be introduced to the importance of the "public good,""the subordination of the individual to the public," and respect for and obedience to the law as soon as possible. Before they left school, young children should know the rights and duties of citizenship and the need to protect one's liberty from neighbor , government, and foreign nations.

> If it should seem to any that there is no room in the elementary schools for such work [civics], I should not hesitate to say, "Make room"...The people of this country need political education more than they do industrial education....every large city in the country is ruled by its slums. As a matter of public policy it would be a waste of energy to multiply skilled mechanics by public education and then leave them to be, first the tools and then the victims of any blatant demagogue who chose to trumpet himself as the champion of labor.

The situation, Martin argued, was critical. "City life is unfavorable to it [patriotism], so is business life; the love of money excludes it. An alien population cherishing a worthy love for a mother-country across the sea, experiences but slowly what Chalmers called 'the explosive power of a new affection.' All these considerations point toward danger unless the schools do something ." Three years later, Martin told the readers of the Journal of Education that civics instruction had to show the threats to stability which anarchy and anarchists posed. "The community is so honeycombed by a maudlin sentiment of sympathy for those men, that the teachers cannot be too earnest in impressing the truth." Through the 1890's Martin continued this now frantic tone on the perils facing the country. At a National Education Association meeting in 1895, he called for a new wave of patriotic citizenship in which teachers taught their students how to meet and conquer the dangers of social disharmony, modeling their lessons after such men as William the Silent, Cromwell, Lafayette, Bolivar, Washington, "all men with swords in their hands."[42]

---

[41] Alexander J. Inglis, The Rise of the High School in Massachusetts (New York, 1911), pp. 142-43; George H. Martin, A Text Book on Civil Government in the United States (New York, 1875), pp. 50, 219-24, 300.

This impending sense of anarchy, the doubts which had emerged by the end of the nineteenth century over the efficacy of the American experiment, significantly revised the earlier optimism about the spirit of American life and the belief that citizenship could be taught as an adjunct to broader moral and literary learning. Separate courses in civics entered the public school curriculum, no longer concerned simply with the structure of government and its normal processes, now open to serious question, but with the responsibility of each individual to overcome the faults of "mobocracy." Politics ceased to be political theory, and became instead the corrupt activities of the ward boss. The most important public question, A Course in Citizenship proclaimed in 1914, is "how to develop a class of trained citizens who shall bring into political life such upright devotion and such a high degree of efficient service that our civic life will show the results." Knowledge of what voting involved as a function of government now had to be supplemented by instruction on who to vote for. Citizenship was defined by "good will and expressed in service," its central duty patriotism. It was no use, John Fiske wrote in his school text, Civil Government in the United States, to limit citizenship to the broad themes of national policy and federal institutions. "Questions of civil government are practical business questions, the principles of which are as often and as forcibly illustrated in a city council or a county board of supervisors, as in the House of Representatives in Washington." Offering their students exposure to the workings of the national government, the new civics' educators placed local issues, indeed, local corruptions, at the forefront of their lessons, seeking to instil behavior patterns to overcome the deleterious effects of the immediate social environment. "It behooves the teachers of the United States," A Course in Citizenship concluded, "to begin the foundations of such a crusade [for better, more responsible citizens] with the children." On the eve of World War I, Massachusetts' educators, enlarging their conception of childhood to include adult immigrants, had already begun their crusade. The war would ratify and institutionalize that decision.[43]

---

[42] George Martin, "Special Preparation for Citizenship," pp. 71-75, 80; ibid., "Occasional Lessons in Civics: Anarchy and Anarchists," Journal of Education, 26: 11/24/87, 210-11; ibid., "New Standards of Patriotic Citizenship," National Education Association, Proceedings, 1895, pp. 134-39.

---

[43] Ella Lyman Cabot, et al., A Course in Citizenship (Boston, 1914), pp. xiii, xviii-xix, 129; Fiske, Civil Government, pp. viii-ix. On the expansion of courses in civics in Massachusetts schools, see Massachusetts Board of Education, Annual Report, 1891-92, pp. 161-65; ibid., 1914-15, pp. 226-27, 289; ibid., 1915-16, p. 58.

## CHAPTER IX

## FORM AND SUBSTANCE IN URBAN EDUCATION

During the last decades of the nineteenth century, Massachusetts' educators sought relevance. Confronted by a changing and seemingly hostile environment, they adopted reforms, often after acrimonious debate and with significant modification, which they believed would make the public school a more meaningful institution. Yet their attempts were more often confused than meaningful. Frequently unable to distinguish between the problems raised by the city and those of technology, confused about the relationship between social class and ethnic background, they oscillated between reconstructing urban society as a totality and uplifting particular parts or groups in that society. Uncertain of whether issues were economic, social, or political, they lumped all together, and assumed that their solutions met all the requirements. There thus emerged a peculiar disjunction between the rhetoric of educational reform and the substance of particular reforms. Unable to comprehend late nineteenth century change---in this they were representative of most Americans---but determined to encompass all the issues raised by change, the schoolmen's rhetoric made their responses seem crucial to the future of American society. Each reform was responsible to a host of social problems, each found support from groups interested in distinct questions, groups often antagonistic to one another. Having to overcome political opposition and the weight of tradition—and the public schools were both political and traditional—educational reformers adopted a rhetoric of universalism. In practice, however, the reforms were tangential to the problems of urban life. Revisions in pedagogy, expansion of schooling's social responsibilities, these had little to do with poverty and social conditions external to the school. Politics, moreover, often revised initial proposals, economics shaped implementation and narrowed policy, issues ostensibly confronted were by-passed. But the rhetoric remained, and in the end form became a surrogate for substance.

While the alternatives are difficult to construct, in retrospect none of this was inevitable. Much of the ideology and the implementation of educational reform evolved out of hostility toward the social environment and the institutions Massachusetts' educators confronted. Society, the schoolmen believed, had once been homogeneous, its institutions balanced and sharing in the education of its participants. That harmony, epitomized in the reminiscences of rural childhood before the Civil War, had been rudely shattered by the intrusions of industry and the city. Yet if the educators believed in the existence of a once harmonious society, they also believed in the new economy, and assumed that the material benefits of technology outweighed its faults. They thus focused their concern upon the social and moral effects of industrialization, upon the city and its inhabitants. The factory, necessary for economic progress, undermined traditional notions of labor. Satisfaction and pride in work, identification as a producer, these could exist only tenuously when a man's labor was tied to a machine he could no longer control or when he rarely observed or understood the entire work process. Isolated from his work, he and his family lived in an environment which both caused and reflected fragmented institutions. Here, Massachusetts' schoolmen revealed their greatest confusion, and ultimate hostility. On the one hand, relationships in the city inevitably destroyed institutional harmony and prevented the transmission of traditional social values. At the same time, the city's inhabitants, especially the poor and immigrant--by the 1890's the two were synonymous in the eyes of the educators--lacked those values to begin with. Did the inhabitants suffer from the trauma of urban life or did the city suffer from its inhabitants? The answer was indeterminate. While the street lured children to it, undermining the safer and more desirable institutions of socialization like the school and family, the immigrant child, denied space by his tenement quarters and lacking the restraints of a stable family life, consciously sought the antisocial environment of "street land." Unable to assess blame, but determined that blame be placed if cures were to be effected, educators lumped the city and immigrant together, and determined to reform both.

These confused and hostile feelings prevented the schoolmen from adequately confronting the problems they faced. Educational change which might have been viewed as supplements to the child's social environment was instead undertaken as a substitute for the environment, standing in opposition to the fragmenting conditions of his life. The kindergarten offers an excellent example. Applied to the affluent, it represented a broader socialization agency than the family, but did not seek to usurp the role of the latter. When applied to the slum, however, it first sought to revise family life, seemingly capable of reshaping the patterns of growth and restoring community to the heterogeneous urban neighborhood. After 1900, however, the kindergarten turned inward seeking to replace the family and neighborhood, seeing the latter two as hostile antagonists in the battle for the child's and society's future.

Trends in the kindergarten reflected broader developments. Indeed, one of the most striking and recurring themes in the writings and addresses of Massachusetts' educators during the half century before World War I is the despair at the social disharmony of urban life. Despite the commitments to social reform, educators argued, the schools continued to work in a hostile and fragmented environment with traditional values threatened and children dropping out of school before they were ready for the labor market. There had been, they admitted, improvements. More children attended school and stayed longer than ever before. An expanded curriculum, better teachers, the addition of health care, sensitivity to some of the physical needs of children, these had improved the quality of schooling. They had not, however, substantially reformed the city or its inhabitants, and herein lay a clue to the changing practices and ideology of education on the eve of World War I.

Having produced only limited if any social reforms--neither manual training nor the kindergarten seemed substantially to alter attitudes toward work or child rearing practices--educators questioned their broader goals. They began to argue, in practice first, then as an ideology, that the school should not be involved in the social reform of institutions, but rather should concentrate on the child, his future and his abilities. The goal of education ceased to be the balancing of institutions so that each shared in the educational responsibilities of society, and became instead the immediate integration of children into particular institutions, allowing the latter to function more efficiently. While educators continued to refer to schooling as a corrector of social ills, and indeed, seemed to enlarge their obligations, in practice they accepted technological change and social malfunctioning as given. Equally important, they helped make the school an institution whose primary responsibility was to its own functional efficiency. The transition of manual training into vocational education is a pertinent example. Encompassing a variety of themes, manual education was primarily designed to restore social values and protect society from the disorganizing effects of technology. By 1900, in Massachusetts, that ideology seemed to have achieved a widespread consensus, yet it quickly came under attack. The schools, the supporters of vocational education claimed, should not be in the business of restoring a sense of shared values to the family or curing the social effects of industrialization. America's problem was productivity; the school's role to prepare each child for more efficient production, and that involved reorganizing the school itself into an efficiently run institution. Within the school, children and teachers became categorized members of the plant; learning became preparation for each succeeding grade level. Prevocational classes, followed by the junior high school, and vocational guidance emerged as preparation for the real world outside the school and as efficient preparation for the next stage within the school. The kindergarten, to take another example, moved from its social reformist orientation to the pre-primary classroom, whose definition of success was determined by the efficiency with which its products met the classroom requirements of the first grade.

These changes were not the only ones which occurred between 1870 and World War I in Massachusetts. Nor were the trends as clear as the above description suggests. Change was subtle, often involving a refocused emphasis or a failure to implement or complete a response rather than an explicit rejection. Continuity remained important. While vocational educators distinguished themselves from the earlier manual training enthusiasts, both were linked by an adherence to modern industrialism. A number of educators continued to call for broad social involvement and reform. Kindergartners never entirely dropped their desire to see the child become an agent of community uplift. The school as a neighborhood institution with the overtones of the social settlement achieved some popularity after 1910 with the appearance of evening centers. Yet these developments, central to the activities of school reformers between 1870 and 1900, no longer revealed the essential thrust of urban education on the eve of World War I. From concern with the social institutions of society, the schools had turned to focus on individual achievement and individual behavior. Defining the former in terms of progress through school, Massachusetts' educators turned away from the goals of social restoration and community harmony. To assure proper behavior patterns, the citizenship classes of the evening schools and the history and civics textbooks explicitly taught individuals how and what kind of decisions to make: how to dress, what to eat, who not to vote for, how to get work. The notion of shared educational responsibility, strained in the late nineteenth century, practically disappeared after 1900 with the school taking its place as the sole repository of educational training.

A new ideology of education also emerged whose key words were achievement, measurement, differentiation, and efficiency. Under a rhetoric of individual development and social efficiency, students were categorized on the basis of vocational guidance and test measurement, and given separate school programs. Commitment to a common curriculum and to the sharing of school opportunities among all school children receded before a definition of equality of educational opportunity which claimed separate places for separate kinds of children, necessary in a bureaucratic and specialized society. As part of this process of categorization and differentiation, the "manually-motivated," their futures often predicated upon their parents' backgrounds, received particular attention. Whatever the validity of vocational training--there was little testing of whether industrial education actually enhanced social mobility more than other kinds of schooling--or the adequacy of school standards, it was clear from its origin that children chosen as "motor-minded" were also children who had failed at the regular school course. From its inception, then, vocational education as a part of industrial training possessed a connotation of second-class citizenship, a condition from which it never satisfactorily recovered.

The new educational ideology of urban Massachusetts thus combined two extreme attitudes toward American society. On the one hand, it gloried in the progress and techniques of industrial America. Educators likened their institution to the efficiently run industrial factory. They saw themselves as the shapers of the raw material which, when emerging as finished products, would fulfill the needs of a hierarchical and specialized society. Their primary concern, therefore, became the earliest possible differentiation of children: how to determine the categories which students would fulfill and what kinds of schooling to provide for those categories. On the other hand, Massachusetts' educators rejected the urban environment in which they worked as implacably hostile to socially valuable schooling. Less concerned now about reinvigorating inadequately functioning institutions, they sought to withdraw the child and the school from the environment around them. Frustrated by their late nineteenth century attempts at urban reform through educational change, they ceased to believe in the possibilities of reform, and they turned to isolating the city school from the urban community. In this way, the educators synthesized service and institutional independence, and offered the urban school as a glorification and opponent of social trends.

In the decades after World War I even greater calls for service would be combined with increasing demands for professional independence, and educators would accept ever larger responsibilities. Few, however, would ask who benefited, how achievement took place, and whether alternative forms of democratic schooling existed. Convinced that the public school served society, educators failed to ask who was being served. Accepting broad social responsibilities, they infrequently questioned whether the school could perform all it was asked. With rhetoric and form acting as a surrogate for substance, these unraised questions would become the burden of urban education.

# BIBLIOGRAPHY

## Primary

### I. Manuscript Collections.

Agassiz, Elizabeth Cary. Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Almy, Mrs. Charles [Helen]. Papers, 1899-1910. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Denison House. Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Eliot, Abigail Adams. A Tribute to. . . the New England Association of Nursery Educators, 1952. Unpublished ms. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Emery, William M. Papers (scrapbook with articles from New Bedford and Fall River newspapers, 1930's and 1940's). New Bedford Public Library.

Lowell Day Nursery. Records, 1889-1914. Lowell Day Nursery.

Lynn. Cobbet School Work, 1902-03. 7 vols. Lynn Public Library.

Lynn Independent Industrial Shoemaking School. Papers. School Offices, Lynn.

Lynn Schoolmasters Club. Records, 1889-1913. 2 vols. Lynn Public Library.

Massachusetts. Hearings of the State Departments and Institutions Before the House Committee on Ways and Means, 1911. Massachusetts State Library.

Massachusetts. Investigation of State Departments and Institutions, 1911. 3 vols. Massachusetts State Library.

Massachusetts Commission on Commerce and Industry. Report, 1907. Massachusetts State Library.

Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education. Hearings on Technical Education, May 15, 1908, on Senate Bill #335. Massachusetts State Library.

Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. Hearings, 1905. Massachusetts State Library.

Mothers' Club of Cambridge. Papers, 1878-1942. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

[New Bedford.] Immigrants in New Bedford, 1911. New Bedford Public Library.

Ne . Bedford. Records of the School Committee, 1880-1915. School Committee Headquarters.

North Bennet Street Industrial School. Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Shaw, Pauline Agassiz. Papers on Mrs. Shaw in Women's Rights Collection, folders 1042-45. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Wheelock, Lucy. Papers. Wheelock College Library, Boston.

White, Eva Whiting. Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Woman's Education Association, Committee on Industrial Education, Report, 1873. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Woman's Education Association. Papers, 1872-1951. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Papers. Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

## II. Annual Reports and Proceedings.

American Institute of Instruction. Proceedings and Addresses. 1870-1915.
Associated Charities of Boston. Annual Report. 1879-1898.
Beverly. Annual Report of the School Committee of the City of Beverly. 1900-1916.
[Boston] Farm and Trades School, Thompson's Island. Annual Report. 1852-1914.
Boston. Documents of the School Committee. 1870-1916.
Boston. Minutes of the School Committee. 1869-1905.
Cambridge. Report of the School Committee and Report of the Superintendent of the Schools. 1870-1915.
Fall River. Annual School Report of the City of Fall River. 1870-1915.
Haverhill. Annual Report of the Public Schools. 1870-1915.
"Inaugural Address of the Mayor." City Documents. Cambridge, Fall River, Haverhill, Lawrence, Lowell, New Bedford, Worcester, 1870-1915.
Industrial School for Girls, Dorchester. Report of the Board of Managers. 1873-1914.
Lawrence. Annual Report of the School Committee. 1870-1915.
Lowell. Annual Report of the School Committee. 1870-1915.
Lowell Textile School. Catalogue. 1897-1915.
Lynn. Annual Report of the School Committee. 1870-1915.
Massachusetts Board of Education. Annual Report of the Board of Education Together with the Annual Report of the Secretary. 1869-1916.
Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor. Annual Report. 1870-1915.
Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education. Annual Report. 1907-1909.
National Education Association. Journal of Proceedings and Addresses. 1880-1915.
New Bedford. Annual Report of the School Committee. 1870-1915.
New Bedford Textile School. Catalogue. 1899-1908.
North Bennet Street Industrial School. Annual Report. 1881-1915.
Springfield. Report of the School Committee. 1870-1915.
Worcester. Report of the Worcester Schools. 1870-1915.

## III. Books.

Allinson, May. Dressmaking As A Trade for Women in Massachusetts. Studies in Economic Relations of Women, vol. 4. Columbia University: New York, 1916.
Allinson, May. Industrial Experience of Trade-School Girls in Massachusetts. Studies in Economic Relations of Women, vol. 9. Women's Educational and Industrial Union: Boston, 1917.
Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. Industrial Education. 23: January, 1909.
Anderson, John J. A Grammar School History of the United States. Clark and Maynard: New York, 1869.
Antin, Mary. The Promised Land. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1912.
Ayres, Leonard. Laggards in Our Schools. Russell Sage Foundation: New York, 1909.

Bloomfield, Meyer. *The Vocational Guidance of Youth.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1911.

Bloomfield, Meyer. *Youth, School, and Vocation.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1915.

Boone, Richard G. *Education in the United States.* D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1889.

Boston Finance Commission. *Report of A Study of Certain Phases of the Public School System of Boston.* Boston, 1916.

Boston Finance Commission. *Report on the Boston School System.* Boston, 1911.

Bosworth, Louise Marion. *The Living Wage of Women Workers.* The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science: Philadelphia, 1911.

Burton, Warren. *The District School As It Was.* Edited by Clifton Johnson. Lee and Shepard: Boston, 1897.

Cabot, Ella Lyman, et. al. *A Course in Citizenship.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1914.

Chancellor, William E. *Standard Short Course for Evening Schools.* American Book Company: New York, 1911.

Channing, Edward. *A Students' History of the United States.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1901.

Davis, Philip. *And Crown Thy Glory.* Philosophical Library: New York, 1952.

Davis, Philip and Kroll, Grace. *Street Land, Its Little People and Big Problems.* Small, Maynard and Company: Boston, 1915.

Dean, Arthur D. *The Worker and the State.* The Century Company: New York, 1910.

Dunn, Arthur W. *The Community and the Citizen.* D. C. Heath and Company: Boston, 1907.

Dutton, Samuel T. *Social Phases of Education in the School and the Home.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1899.

Fiske, John. *Civil Government in the United States Considered with Some Reference to Its Origins.* Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1890.

Fiske, John. *A History of the United States for Schools.* Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1901.

Fremont, Jessie Benton, Pratt, Ella F., et. al. *How to Learn and Earn or Half Hours in Some Helpful Schools.* D. Lothrop and Company: Boston, 1884.

Frost, John. *A History of the United States for the Use of Schools and Academies.* Edward C. Biddle: Philadelphia, 1837.

Garland, Mary J. *Essays on the Kindergarten.* Boston, [1934?]

Goodrich, Charles A. *A History of the United States of America.* H. F. Sumner and Company: Hartford, 1839.

[Goodrich, S. G.] *Peter Parley's Common School History.* E. H. Butler and Company: Philadelphia, 1858.

[Goodrich, S. G.] *The Tales of Peter Parley About America.* S. G. Goodrich and Company: Boston, 1839.

Gordy, Wilbur F. *A History of the United States for Schools.* Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1900.

Hall, G. Stanley. *Adolescence.* 2 vols. D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1904.

Hall, G. Stanley. *Aspects of Child Life and Education.* D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1921.

Hanus, Paul H. *Adventuring in Education.* Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1937.

Hanus, Paul H. *Beginnings in Industrial Education and Other Educational Discussions.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1908.

Hanus, Paul H. *Educational Aims and Educational Values.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1908.

Hanus, Paul H. *A Modern School.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1904.

Harrington, W. L. and Moore, Agnes C. *A Second Book for Non-English Speaking People.* D. C. Heath and Company: Boston, 1904.

Hedges, Anna Charlotte. *Wage Worth of School Training.* Teachers College: New York, 1915.

Hemenway, Mary. *A Memorial of the Life and Benefactions of Mary Hemenway, 1820-1894.* Privately printed, 1927.

Higginson, Thomas Wentworth. *Young Folks' History of the United States.* Lee and Shepard: Boston, 1875, 1883, 1891.

Hill, Mabel and Davis, Philip. *Civics for New Americans.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1915.

International Kindergarten Union. *Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Meeting.* 1909.

International Kindergarten Union, Committee of Nineteen. *The Kindergarten.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1913.

Johnson, Clifton. *The Country School in New England.* D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1893.

Kilpatrick, William H. *Froebel's Kindergarten Principles Critically Examined.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1916.

Kingsbury, Susan M., editor. *Labor Laws and Their Enforcement.* Studies in Economic Relations of Women, vol. 2. Longmans, Green and Company: New York, 1911.

Kingsbury, Susan M. and Moses, Mabelle. *Licensed Workers in Industrial Home Work in Massachusetts.* Boston, 1915.

Larsson, Gustaf. *Elementary Sloyd and Whittling.* Silver, Burdett and Company: New York, 1906.

Larsson, Gustaf. *Sloyd.* Boston, 1902.

Leavitt, Frank M. *Examples of Industrial Education.* Ginn and Company: Boston, 1912.

Leavitt, Frank M. and Brown, Edith. *Prevocational Education in the Public Schools.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1915.

Lee, Joseph. *Constructive and Preventive Philanthropy.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1902.

Lee, Joseph. *Play in Education.* Macmillan Company: New York, 1916.

LeRow, Caroline B. *English As She is Taught: Genuine Answers to Examination Questions in Our Public Schools.* New York, 1887

LeRow, Caroline B. *The "Young Idea": or Common School Culture.* Cassell and Company: New York, 1888.

Lincoln, Jonathan Thayer. *The City of the Dinner-Pail.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1909.

Lowell: *A City of Spindles.* Trades and Labor Council: Lowell, 1900.

[Lowell]. *In and About Lowell.* 1908.

Mann, Mary and Peabody, Elizabeth. *Moral Culture of Infancy and Kindergarten Guide.* T. O. H. P. Burnham: Boston, 1863.

Martin, George H. *Essentials of Education.* Edited by Joseph A. Pitman. The Gorham Press: Boston, 1932.

Martin, George H. *The Evolution of the Massachusetts Public School System.* D. Appleton and Company: New York, 1904.

Martin, George H. *A Text Book on Civil Government in the United States.* A. S. Barnes and Company: New York, 1875.

Massachusetts Board of Education. *Report of the Committee Appointed to Investigate the Existing Systems of Manual Training and Industrial Education.* Boston, 1893.

Massachusetts Commission on Immigration. *The Problem of Immigration in Massachusetts.* Boston, 1914.

Massachusetts Commission on Industrial and Technical Education. *Report.* Boston, 1906.

Merrill, Estelle M. H., editor. *Cambridge Sketches by Cambridge Authors.* Cambridge Y.W.C.A.: Cambridge, 1896.

Montgomery, D. H. *The Leading Facts of American History.* Ginn and Company: Boston, 1891.

Mowry, William A. *Elements of Civil Government.* Silver, Burdett and Company: New York, 1900.

Mowry, William A. *Recollections of a New England Educator, 1838-1908.* Silver, Burdett and Company: New York, 1908.

O'Brien, Sara R. *English for Foreigners.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1909.

O'Brien, Sara R. *English for Foreigners.* Book 2. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1912.

[Page, Anne, et. al.] *The Kindergarten and the School.* Milton Bradley Company: Springfield, 1886.

Parsons, Frank. *Choosing A Vocation.* Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1909.

Peabody, Elizabeth P. *Lectures in the Training Schools for Kindergartners.* D. C. Heath and Company: Boston, 1893.

Peabody, Elizabeth P. *Record of Mr. Alcott's School.* Roberts Brothers: Boston, 1874 (third edition).

Perry, Clarence A. *Wider Use of the School Plant.* Russell Sage Foundation: New York, 1910.

Perry, Lorinda. *Millinery As A Trade for Women.* Studies in Economic Relations of Women, vol. 5. Longmans, Green and Company: New York, 1916.

Prosser, Charles A. *A Study of the Boston Mechanic Arts High School.* Teachers College: New York, 1915.

Salmon, David and Hindshaw, Winifred. *Infant Schools: Their History and Theory.* Longmans, Green and Company: London, 1904.

Scott, Colin. *Social Education.* Ginn and Company: Boston, 1908.

Scudder, Horace E. *A History of the United States of America.* William Ware and Company: Boston, 1884.

Scudder, Horace E. A History of the United States of America. American Book Company: New York, 1907.

Seidel, Robert. Industrial Instruction. Translated by Margaret K. Smith. D. C. Heath and Company: Boston, 1887.

Pauline Agassiz Shaw. Tributes Paid Her Memory. Boston, 1917.

Smith, Nora A. The Children of the Future. Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1898.

Snedden, David. Administration and Educational Work of American Juvenile Reform Schools. Columbia University: New York, 1907.

Tappan, Eva March. Our Country's Story: An Elementary History of the United States. Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1902.

Thompson, Frank V. Schooling of the Immigrant. Harper and Brothers: New York, 1920.

Vandewalker, Nina C. The Kindergarten in American Education. Macmillan Company: New York, 1908.

Wiggin, Kate Douglas, editor. The Kindergarten. Harper and Brothers: New York, 1893.

Wiggin, Kate Douglas. The Story of Patsy. Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1893.

Winslow, Charles H., editor. Report of the Committee on Industrial Education of the American Federation of Labor. 1912.

Woods, Robert A. Americans in Process. Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1903.

Woods, Robert A. The City Wilderness. Houghton, Mifflin and Company: Boston, 1898.

Woods, Robert A. and Kennedy, Albert J. The Zone of Emergence. Edited by Sam B. Warner, Jr. Joint Center for Urban Studies of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University: Cambridge, 1962.

Woods, Robert A., Tucker, William J., et. al. The Poor in Great Cities. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1895.

## IV. Pamphlets.

Associated Charities of Boston. Circular Letter to Sewing Societies. October 20, 1879.

Associated Charities of Boston. Report of the Committee on Industrial Training. 1881.

Associated Charities of Boston. Rules and Suggestions for Visitors of the Associated Charities. 1884.

Auchmuty, Richard, et. al. Trade Schools. The North End Union: Boston, 1893.

Balliet, Thomas, et. al. Report on the Problem of Elementary Schools. Boston, 1903.

Batchelder, Lizzie S. A Memorial on Industrial Schools, Delivered Before the Comm. on Education of Massachusetts Legislature. February, 1872.

Bates, Joshua. Our Common Schools. Boston, 1879.

Beatty, A. B. Corporation Schools. Public School Publishing Company: 1918.

Brooks, Christopher P. Review of Recent Progress in Textile Education in the United States: Paper Read Before the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers. 1906.

Cambridge. *Courses of Study and Rules of the School Committee.* 1901, 1904, 1907.

Cambridge. *A Provisional Course of Study for the Public Schools.* 1911.

Cambridge. *A Provisional Course of Study in United States History.* 1922.

Committee of 100. *Hearing at the State House Before the Joint Committee on Education.* March 20-April 25, 1889.

Connell, William. *Free Text-Books and Supplies.* 1886.

Dickinson, John W. *Principles and Methods of Teaching: Derived from a Knowledge of the Mind.* Emerson College of Oratory: Boston, 1898.

Dodd, Alvin and Prosser, Charles. *What Chambers of Commerce Can Do for Vocational Education.* National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education: New York, 1913.

Dodge, Harriet Hazen. *Survey of Occupations Open to the Girl of 14 to 16 Years.* Girls Trade Education League: Boston, 1912.

Draper, Andrew S. *The Crucial Test of the Public School System.* Boston, 1897.

Emerson, Thomas. *Free Text Books.* Boston, 1888.

Follett, Mary P. *Evening Centers: Aims and Duties of Managers and Leaders Therein.* Boston, 1913.

Francke, Marie. *Opportunities for Women in Domestic Science.* Association of Collegiate Alumnae: Philadelphia, 1916.

Fuller, Homer T. *Progress of Technical Education.* 1894.

Greener, George. *An Experiment in Vocational Guidance and Placement.* Boston, 1919.

Hall, Marjory. *For What Does the Day Nursery Stand?* Federation of Day Nurseries: New York, 1904.

Hoar, George F. *Claims of the Free Institute of Industrial Science [of Worcester] Upon the Commonwealth.* Presented before the Committee on Education of the Legislature of Massachusetts. February 11, 1869.

Industrial Education Association. *Manual Training at Springfield, Massachusetts.* Educational Leaflet #4. New York, 1888.

Larsson, Gustaf. *Sloyd for American Schools.* [1894].

Lawrence. *A Syllabus for the Instruction of Non-English Speaking Pupils in the Evening Schools.* 1908.

Lee, Joseph. *Play As An Antidote to Civilization.* 1911.

Lowell. *Evening Schools of Lowell, A Brief Sketch of Their Origin, Growth, and Present Conditions.* [1912?].

Mahoney, John J. and Herlihy, C. M. *First Steps in Americanization.* Boston, 1918.

Mahoney, John J. and Chamberlin, H. H. *The Lawrence Plan for Education in Citizenship.* National Security League: New York, 1918.

Marble, Albert P. *Discussions on Manual Training and on the Blair Bill: Addresses to the National Education Association.* Boston, 1888.

Marble, Albert P. *Industrial Education As Part of the Common School Course: Address to the New England School Superintendents' Association.* Boston, 1885.

Marble, Albert P. The Presumption of Brains. Boston, [1887?].

Martin, George H. *Industrial Education and the Public Schools: Address Before the Massachusetts Teachers' Association.* Boston, 1908.

Martin, George H. Remarks of Secretary George H. Martin Before the Legislative Committee on Education in Opposition to the Proposed Plan to Abolish the State Board of Education. 1909.

Marvel, L. H. Manual Education in the Public Schools. Boston, 1882.

Massachusetts Board of Education. Independent Industrial Schools. 1913.

Massachusetts Board of Education. A Partial List. . . Offering Vocational Training. 1913.

Massachusetts Board of Education. Report on the Needs and Possibilities of Part Time Education. 1913.

Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education. Bulletins. #1-11, 1907-08.

Massachusetts Commission on Industrial Education. Report on the Organization and Methods of the Several Textile Schools in the Commonwealth. 1908.

Massachusetts Department of Education. Qualifications for Continuation and Evening Schools. Circular Letter #47. 1918.

[Massachusetts General Court]. Protest Against the Majority Report. . . on the Employment and Schooling of Children and Against Any Legislative Interference with Private Schools. 1888.

National Council of Education. The Educational Value of Manual Training: Report of the Committee on Pegagogics. 1889.

National Education Association. Report of the Committee on the Place of Industries in Public Education. 1910.

National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. Apprenticeship and Corporation Schools. Bulletin #13, Part II, 1911.

National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. Part Time and Evening Schools. Bulletin #13, Part III, 1911.

National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. The Social Significance of Industrial Education. Bulletin #13, Part IV, 1911.

National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education. Trade Education for Girls. Bulletin #13, Part I, 1911.

New Bedford School Committee. Kindergartens. [1903].

Paine, Robert Treat, Jr. Address of the President of the Associated Charities of Boston. 1879.

Parkinson, William D. The Place of the Kindergarten in Public Education. 1909.

Peabody, Elizabeth. Kindergarten--What Is It? 1862.

Peabody, Elizabeth. Report and New Prospectus of Kindergarten. Boston, 1862.

Sayward, William. The Relation of the Trade School to the Trade. North End Union: Boston, 1908.

Smith, Walter. Industrial Education and Drawing As Its Basis. Boston, 1878.

Sprague, Homer B. Ought Text-Books to Be Supplied Gratuitously to All Children in the Public Schools? Chicago, [1888].

Stetson, George R. Literacy and Crime in Massachusetts and the Necessity for Moral and Industrial Training in the Public Schools. 1886.

Vocation Office for Girls, Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Vocations for Girls. 14 vols. Girls Trade Education League: Boston, 1911-12.

Walsh, Rev. Louis S. The Early Catholic Schools of Lowell, Massachusetts, 1835-1852. Boston, 1901.

Wiggin, Kate D. The Free Kindergarten Work of the Pacific Coast. San Francisco, 1884.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Industrial Home Work in Massachusetts. Boston, 1915.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Social Conditions in Domestic Service. Boston, 1900.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Social Statistics of Working Women. Boston, 1901.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. Trained and Supplementary Workers in Domestic Service. Boston, 1906.

Wood, Allen. The Stars and Stripes: A Patriotic Sentiment of the Fifth Street Grammar. New Bedford, 1898.

Wood, Allen F. Sylvia Ann Howland Educational Fund. New Bedford, 1900.

Worcester. Course of Study, Elementary Schools. 1912.

Worcester. Course of Study for Primary and Grammar Schools. 1893.

Worcester. Courses of Study in Mathematics, Geography, History, and Language for the Elementary Schools. 1899, 1905.

Worcester. Questions for Written Examinations. 1872-95.

Worcester. Suggestions to Teachers and Hours of Study in the Evening Schools. 1893.

Worcester. Suggestions to Teachers on the Course of Study for Primary and Grammar Schools. 1893.

## V. Articles.

Butler, Nicholas Murray. "Some Criticisms of the Kindergarten." Educational Review. 18: October, 1899, 285-91.

Channing, Walter (M.D.). "The Importance of Physical Training in Childhood." Educational Review. 10: November, 1895, 262-72.

Gilmour, R. "What Shall the Public Schools Teach?" The Forum. 5: June, 1888, 454-60.

Hanus, Paul H. "Public Trade Schools." The Bulletin of the Winona Technical Institute. 5: August, 1909.

Isaacs, Abram S. "What Shall the Public Schools Teach?" The Forum. 6: October, 1888, 204-11.

Larcom, Lucy. "American Factory Life--Past, Present and Future." Journal of Social Science. 16: December, 1882, 141-46.

Lee, Joseph. "Kindergarten Principles in Social Work." Charities. 11: December 5, 1903, 532-37.

Marshall, Florence M. "Shops for Trade Training." The Federation Bulletin. November, 1907.

Peabody, Elizabeth. "Kindergarten Schools." Massachusetts Teacher. 22 (3rd series): July, 1870, 233-41.

Peabody, Elizabeth. "A Plea for Froebel's Kindergarten As the First Grade of Primary Education" in Cardinal Nicholas Wiseman. The Identification of the Artisan and Artist. Boston, 1869.

Perkins, Charles C. "Art Education in America." *Journal of Social Science*. 1871, 35-57.

Perkins, Charles C. "Art Schools." *Journal of Social Science*. 1871, 95-104.

Prince, Lucinda W. "Training for Saleswomen." *The Federation Bulletin*. February, 1908.

Rice, Joseph M. "The Public Schools of Boston." *The Forum*. 14: February, 1893, 753-67.

Schindler, Solomon. "The Study of History in the Public Schools." *The Arena*. 1: December, 1889, 41-54.

Scudder, Horace E. "Literature in the Public Schools." *Atlantic Monthly*. 62: August, 1888, 223-30.

Stephens, George A. "Influence of Trade Education Upon Wages." *Journal of Political Economy*. 19: 1911, 17-35.

## VI. Periodicals and Newspapers.

*The Boston Common*. 1910-13.

*Boston Transcript*. 1870-1915.

*Cambridge Chronicle*. 1870-1915.

*Education*. 1880-1915.

*The History Teacher's Magazine*. 1909-15.

*Journal of Education*. 1875-1915. (*New England Journal of Education* prior to 1881.)

*The Kindergarten*. 1888-91.

*Kindergarten Magazine*. 1902-15.

*Kindergarten News*. 1891-97. (*Kindergarten Review* after 1897.)

*Kindergarten Review*. 1897-1915. (*Kindergarten News* before 1897.)

*Lynn Item*. 1900-15.

*Manual Training Magazine*. 1899-1911.

*New Bedford Morning Mercury*. 1906-08.

*New Bedford Standard-Times*. 1906-08.

*New England Journal of Education*. 1875-80. (*Journal of Education* after 1880.)

*New England Magazine*. 1884-1916.

## VII. Government Publications.

Bloomfield, Meyer. *The School and the Start in Life: A Study of the Relation Between School and Employment in England, Scotland, and Germany*. Bulletin #4. U.S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1914.

Carpenter, Niles. *Immigrants and Their Children*. Census Monographs #7. U.S. Bureau of the Census: Washington, 1927.

Clarke, Isaac E. *Art and Industry*. U. S. Senate, Executive Documents, #209, vol. 7, parts 1-4. Forty-Sixth Congress, Second Session.

Davis, Mary D. *Nursery Schools: Their Development and Current Practices in the United States*. Bulletin #9. U. S. Office of Education: Washington, 1932.

Fisher, Laura. "The Kindergarten." *Report of the Commissioner*. U.S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1904, pp. 689-719.

Herlihy, Charles M. *Adult Education for Foreign-Born and Native Illiterates.* Bulletin #36. U. S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1925.

Hill, Joseph A. *Women in Gainful Occupations, 1870 to 1920.* Census Monograph #9. U. S. Bureau of the Census: Washington, 1929.

Jarvis, Edward. "The Value of Common School Education to Common Labor." *Circular of Information #3.* U. S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1879.

Mahoney, John J. *Training Teachers for Americanization.* Bulletin #12. U. S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1920.

Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor. 3 vols. *The Census of Massachusetts, 1875.* Boston, 1876.

Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor. *The Census of Massachusetts, 1885.* 3 vols. Boston, 1887.

Massachusetts Bureau of Statistics of Labor. *A Compendium of the Census of Massachusetts, 1875.* Boston, 1877.

Massachusetts House of Representatives. *Documents.* 1870-1915.

Massachusetts House of Representatives. *Journal.* 1870-1915.

Massachusetts Senate. *Documents.* 1870-1915.

Massachusetts Senate. *Journal.* 1870-1915.

Ross, Frank A. *School Attendance in 1920.* Census Monographs #5. U. S. Bureau of the Census: Washington, 1924.

Thompson, Warren S. *Ratio of Children to Women, 1920.* Census Monograph #11. U. S. Census Bureau: Washington, 1931.

U. S. Bureau of Education. *Education of the Immigrant.* Bulletin #51. Washington, 1913.

U. S. Bureau of Education. *Kindergarten Circulars.* Washington, 1916-25.

U. S. Bureau of Education. *Kindergarten in the United States.* Bulletin #6. Washington, 1914.

U. S. Bureau of Education. *Public Facilities for Educating the Alien.* Bulletin #18. Washington, 1916.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *A Discussion of Age Statistics.* Bulletin #13. Washington, 1904.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Proportion of Children in the United States.* Bulletin #22. Washington, 1905.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Thirteenth Census, 1910.* 11 vols. Washington, 1912-14.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Twelfth Census: Child Labor in the United States.* Bulletin #69. Washington, 1907.

U. S. Bureau of the Census. *Twelfth Census: Statistics of Women At Work.* Washington, 1907.

U. S. Census Office. *Eleventh Census, 1890.* 25 vols. Washington, 1892-97.

U. S. Census Office. *Ninth Census, 1870.* 3 vols. Washington, 1872.

U. S. Census Office. *Tenth Census, 1880.* 22 vols. Washington, 1883-88.

U. S. Census Office. *Twelfth Census, 1900.* 10 vols. Washington, 1901-02.

U. S. Department of Commerce and Labor. *Conditions Under Which Children Leave School to Go to Work.* Washington, 1910.

U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Naturalization. *The Work of the Public Schools with the Bureau of Naturalization.* Washington, 1917-1920.

U. S. Immigration Commission. Reports. 41 vols. Washington, 1911.

U. S. Senate. Report on Condition of Woman and Child Wage-Earners in the United States. 19 vols. Washington, 1910.

Women's Educational and Industrial Union. A Trade School for Girls: A Preliminary Investigation in A Typical Manufacturing City, Worcester, Massachusetts. Bulletin #17. U. S. Bureau of Education: Washington, 1913.

## Secondary

I. Books.

Abrams, Richard M. Conservatism in A Progressive Era: Massachusetts Politics, 1900-12. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1964.

Adams, James T. Frontiers of American Culture: A Study of Adult Education in A Democracy. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1944.

Bailyn, Bernard. Education in the Forming of American Society. Vintage Books: New York, 1960.

Bain, Winifred. Leadership in Childhood Education: A History of Wheelock College, 1888-89 to 1963-64. Wheelock College: Boston, 1964.

Barlow, Melvin L. History of Industrial Education in the U. S. Charles A. Bennett Company: Peoria, 1967.

Baylor, Ruth M. Elizabeth Palmer Peabody: Kindergarten Pioneer. University of Pennsylvania Press: Philadelphia, 1965.

Bedford, Henry. Socialism and the Workers in Massachusetts, 1886-1912. University of Massachusetts Press: Amherst, 1966.

Bennett, Charles A. History of Manual and Industrial Education Up to 1870. The Manual Arts Press: Peoria, 1926.

Bennett, Charles A. History of Manual and Industrial Education, 1870 to 1917. The Manual Arts Press:. Peoria, 1937.

Blodgett, Geoffrey. The Gentle Reformers. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1966.

Bode, Carl. The American Lyceum. Oxford University Press: New York, 1956.

Brauner, Charles J. American Educational Theory. Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, 1964.

Bremner, Robert H. American Philanthropy. University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1960.

Bremner, Robert H. From the Depths: The Discovery of Poverty in the United States. New York University Press: New York, 1966.

Brewer, D. C. The Conquest of New England by the Immigrant. G. P. Putnam's Sons: New York, 1926.

Brewer, John M. History of Vocational Guidance. Harper and Brothers: New York: 1942.

Brewer, John M. The Vocational Guidance Movement. The Macmillan Company: New York, 1919.

Brooks, Van Wyck. *The Flowering of New England.* E. P. Dutton and Company: New York, 1952.

Callahan, Raymond E. *Education and the Cult of Efficiency.* University of Chicago Press: Chicago, 1962.

Clark, Victor S. *History of Manufactures in the United States.* 3 vols. Carnegie Institute: Washington, 1929.

Coburn, Frederick W. *History of Lowell and Its People.* 3 vols. Lewis Historical Publishing Company: New York, 1920.

Cole, Donald. *Immigrant City: Lawrence, Massachusetts, 1845-1921.* University of North Carolina Press: Chapel Hill, 1963.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The American Common School: An Historic Conception.* Teachers College Press: New York, 1951.

Cremin, Lawrence A., editor. *The Republic and the School.* Teachers College: New York, 1957.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *Transformation of the School.* Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1962.

Cremin, Lawrence A. *The Wonderful World of Ellwood P. Cubberley.* Teachers College: New York, 1965.

Davis, Walter G., editor. *Cambridge Fifty Years A City, 1846-1896.* Cambridge, 1897.

*Dictionary of American Biography.* 20 vols. Charles Scribner's Sons: New York, 1928-36.

Drost, Walter. *David Snedden and the Cult of Efficiency.* University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, 1968.

Ducharme, Jacques. *The Shadows of the Trees: The Story of French-Canadians in New England.* Harper and Brothers: New York, 1943.

Eliot, Samuel A. *A History of Cambridge, 1630-1913.* Cambridge, 1913.

Fisher, Berenice. *Industrial Education: American Ideals and Institutions.* University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, 1967.

Grattan, C. Hartley, editor. *American Ideas About Adult Education, 1710-1951.* Teachers College: New York, 1959.

Handlin, Oscar. *Boston's Immigrants.* Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1959 revised edition.

Handlin, Oscar. *John Dewey's Challenge to Education.* Harper and Brothers: New York, 1959.

Handlin, Oscar. *The Uprooted.* Grosset and Dunlap: New York, 1951.

Handlin, Oscar and Mary. *Commonwealth: A Study of the Role of Government in the American Economy: Massachusetts, 1774-1861.* New York University Press: New York, 1947.

Hart, Albert B., editor. *Commonwealth History of Massachusetts.* 5 vols. The State History Company: New York, 1927-30.

Hawkins, Chauncy J. *Samuel Billings Capen.* Pilgrim Press: Boston, 1914.

Higham, John. *Strangers in the Land.* Atheneum: New York, 1963.

Higham, John, Krieger, Leonard, and Gilbert, Felix. *History: The Development of Historical Studies in the United States.* Prentice-Hall: Englewood Cliffs, 1965.

Hofstadter, Richard. The Progressive Historians. Alfred A. Knopf: New York, 1968.

Hutchinson, Edward P. Immigrants and Their Children, 1850-1950. Wiley: New York, 1956.

Inglis, Alexander J. The Rise of the High School in Massachusetts. Contributions to Education, #45. Teachers College: New York, 1911.

International Kindergarten Union, Committee of Nineteen. Pioneers of the Kindergarten in America. The Century Company: New York, 1924.

Katz, Michael. The Irony of Early School Reform. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1968.

Kirkland, Edward. Charles Francis Adams, Jr. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1965.

Knowles, Malcom S. The Adult Education Movement in the U. S. Holt, Rinehart and Winston: New York, 1962.

Kolesnik, Walter B. Mental Discipline in Modern Education. University of Wisconsin Press: Madison, 1962.

Krug, Edward A. The Shaping of the American High School. Harper and Row: New York, 1964.

Levermore, Charles Herbert. Samuel Train Dutton: A Biography. Macmillan Company: New York, 1922.

Lord, Robert H., et. al. History of the Archdiocese of Boston, 1604-1943. Sheed and Ward: New York, 1944.

Mann, Arthur. Yankee Reformers in the Urban Age. Harper Torchbook: New York, 1966.

Massachusetts Department of Education. The Douglas Commission and the Commission on Industrial Education. Boston, 1935.

Mays, Arthur B. The Concept of Vocational Education in the Thinking of the General Educator, 1845 to 1945. University of Illinois Bulletin. 43: January, 1946.

McKelvey, Blake. The Urbanization of America, 1860-1915. Rutgers University Press: New Brunswick, 1963.

O'Connell, William Cardinal. Recollections of Seventy Years. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1934.

Parker, Margaret T. Lowell: A Study of Industrial Development. Macmillan Company: New York, 1940.

Pearson, Henry Greenleaf. Son of New England: James Jackson Storrow. Boston, 1932.

Perrin, John William. The History of Compulsory Education in New England. Meadville, Pennsylvania, 1896.

Prosser, Charles A. and Allen, Charles R. Vocational Education in A Democracy. The Century Company: New York, 1925.

Randall, Mercedes M. Improper Bostonian: Emily Greene Balch. Twayne Publishers: New York, 1964.

Seybolt, Robert. Evening Schools in Colonial America. University of Illinois: Urbana, 1925.

Sizer, Theodore. Secondary Schools at the Turn of the Century. Yale University Press: New Haven, 1964.

Solmon, Lewis C. Estimates of the Costs of Schooling in 1880 and 1890. Krannert School of Industrial Administration Institute Paper #223. Purdue University: Lafayette, 1968.

Solomon, Barbara M. *Ancestors and Immigrants*. Norton: New York, 1965.

Solomon, Barbara M. *Pioneers in Service*. Associated Jewish Philanthropies: Boston, 1956.

Stombaugh, Ray M. *A Survey of the Movements Culminating in Industrial Arts Education*. Contributions to Education #670. Columbia University: New York, 1936.

Strickland, Charles and Burgess, Charles, editors. *Health, Growth, and Heredity: G. Stanley Hall on Education*. Teachers College: New York, 1965.

Taft, Donald R. *Two Portuguese Communities in New England*. Columbia University: New York, 1923.

Tharp, Louise Hall. *The Peabody Sisters of Salem*. Little, Brown and Company: Boston, 1950.

Thernstrom, Stephan. *Poverty and Progress*. Harvard University Press: Cambridge, 1964.

Ulich, Mary Ewen. *Patterns of Adult Education: A Comparative Study*. Pageant Press: New York, 1965.

Ware, Caroline F. *The Early New England Cotton Manufacture*. Houghton Mifflin Company: Boston, 1931.

Warner, Sam B., Jr. *Streetcar Suburbs: The Process of Growth in Boston, 1870-1900*. Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University: Cambridge, 1962.

Welter, Rush. *Public Education and Democratic Thought in America*. Columbia University Press: New York, 1962.

Whitehill, Walter Muir. *Boston: A Topographical History*. Belknap Press: Cambridge, 1959.

Wiebe, Robert. *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*. Hill and Wang: New York, 1967.

Wieder, Arnold A. *The Early Jewish Community of Boston's North End [1870-1900]*. Brandeis University: Waltham, 1962.

Wolfbein, Seymour L. *The Decline of A Cotton Textile City: A Study of New Bedford*. Columbia University Press: New York, 1944.

*Women's Who's Who of America, 1914-15*. Edited by John W. Leonard. The American Commonwealth Company: New York, 1914.

## II. Articles.

Barlow, Melvin. "Development of the Concept of Industrial Education As A Public School Responsibility in California." *History of Education Journal*. 5: Autumn, 1953, 3-6.

Bohn, Donald. "'Artustry' or the Immaculate Misconception of the '70's." *History of Education Quarterly*. 8: Spring, 1968, 107-10.

Cohen, Sol. "The Industrial Education Movement, 1906-17." *American Quarterly*. 20: Spring, 1968, 95-110.

Cross, Robert D. "Origins of Catholic Parochial Schools in America." *American Benedictine Review*. 16: June, 1965, 194-209.

DiLeo, Mario. "North Bennet Street Industrial School." *Italian News*. April 26-November 8, 1963.

Erisman, Fred. "Transcendentalism for American Youth: The Children's Books of Kate Douglas Wiggin." *New England Quarterly*. 41: June, 1968, 238-47.

Fisher, Berenice M. "Education and Philanthropy." *Teachers College Record.* 68: May, 1967, 622-30.

Forbes, Edward Waldo. "The Agassiz School." *Publications.* Cambridge Historical Society. 35: 1953-54, 35-56.

Hall, Edwin H. "Historical Sketch of Charitable Societies in Cambridge." *Publications.* Cambridge Historical Society. 18: 1925, 11-26.

Harmon, Richard. "The 'Beast' in Boston: Benjamin F. Butler As Governor of Massachusetts." *Journal of American History.* 55: November, 1968, 266-80.

Harris, Neil. "The Gilded Age Revisited: Boston and the Museum Movement." *American Quarterly.* 14: Winter, 1962, 545-566.

Jackson, Sidney. "Some Ancestors of the 'Extension Course.'" *New England Quarterly.* 14: September, 1941, 505-18.

Katz, Michael. "The Emergence of Bureaucracy in Urban Education: The Boston Case, 1850-1884." *History of Education Quarterly.* 8: Summer-Fall, 1968, 155-88, 319-57.

Katz, Michael. "The 'New Departure' in Quincy, 1873-1881: The Nature of Nineteenth-Century Educational Reform." *The New England Quarterly.* 40: March, 1967, 3-30.

Merk, Lois B. "Boston's Historic Public School Crisis." *New England Quarterly.* 31: June, 1958, 172-99.

Peabody, W. Rodman. "The Browne and Nichols School." *Publications.* Cambridge Historical Society. 22: 1932-33, 105-12.

Perrin, John W. "Indirect Compulsory Education--the Factory Laws of Massachusetts and Connecticut." *Educational Review.* 31: April, 1906, 383-94.

Wood, John W. "Frederick Hastings Rindge." *Publications.* Cambridge Historical Society. 34: 1951-52, 97-110.

Wright, George G. "The Schools of Cambridge, 1800-1870." *Publications.* Cambridge Historical Society. 13: 1918, 89-112.

## III. Theses and Unpublished Papers.

Berger, Morris Isaiah. "The Settlement, the Immigrant and the Public School." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956.

Clarke, Stephen J. "Two Schools and Two Ideas: A Study of Progressivism and Character Education in the Public Schools of the City of Boston and the Parochial Schools of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese of Boston, 1920-1940." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard Graduate School of Education, 1965.

Dutton, Wilbur H. "The Child-Study Movement in America From Its Origin (1880) to the Organization of the Progressive Education Association (1920)." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Stanford University, 1945.

Finn, Chester. "The Irish and the Boston Public Schools." Unpublished ms. in author's possession, 1967.

Herney, John D. "The Movement to Reform the Boston School Committee in 1905." Unpublished ms. in author's possession, 1966.

Horowitz, Daniel. "Response to Industrialism." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1966.

Huggins, Nathan I. "Private Charities in Boston, 1870-1900: A Social History." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1962.

Keith, E. Gordon. "A Financial History of Two Textile Cities [Lowell and Fall River]." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Harvard University, 1936.

Laun, John. "Robert Archey Woods: Architect of the Intra-Urban Village." History honors thesis, Harvard University, 1963 in Harvard University Archives.

Lintner, Sylvia Chace, "A Social History of Fall River, 1859-1879." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Radcliffe College, 1945.

MacDougall, Isabella H. "Transformation of An Ideal; Boston Public Schools, 1888-1891." History honors thesis, Radcliffe College, 1967 in Schlesinger Library.

Midura, Gladys A. "A Critical History of Public Secondary Education in Springfield, Massachusetts." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Connecticut, 1961.

Pierce, A. Alexandra. "Pauline Agassiz Shaw." 1959 in Schlesinger Library, Radcliffe College.

Thernstrom, Stephan. "Working Class Mobility in Industrial America." Paper delivered at Anglo-American Colloquium of Society for Urban History, June, 1968.

Wolf, Beverley and Barry, Ruth B. "History of the Guidance-Personnel Movement in Education." Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1955.